11 “Jews Should Be Exterminated Like Vermin”

In May 1959 Look magazine published a story which—judging by the response of its readers—appalled thousands of Americans. The outspoken article, “Hitlerism in 1959,” was written by Look’s European editor, Edward M. Korry.

What has become known as the “Koeppern case” is the story of a Jewish family who returned from Israel eager to begin a new life in a supposedly “New Germany.” In 1958, Kurt Sumpf and his family moved into the small town of Koeppern, twenty miles outside of Frankfurt, where they invested in an established bakery and coffee shop. Their venture might have turned out quite successfully, except for one important factor. The Look story summed up the situation as follows: “Today the Sumpf family is ruined, their nerves shattered, their savings gone and their hopes crushed. Kurt has been shot at, his wife beaten and his son bullied. Their business is boycotted by Koeppern’s 3,800 people. All this is traceable to one reason only: The Sumpfs are Jews.”

Painstaking investigations by a German newspaperman and the Look editor uncovered the following picture. The ordeal of the Sumpf family started shortly after they had settled in Koeppern. The townspeople soon began to show their animosity and anti-Semitism. They called Sumpf a “Jewish pig” or a “dirty foreigner” whom the Nazis “had forgotten to put in the gas chambers.” There was an obvious intent to drive the “undesirable Jew” out of town. When Sumpf declared that he would remain, some troublemakers resorted to physical violence. Kurt and his wife Margot were assaulted, and one day in early October, a bullet was sent through the window of the bakery, narrowly missing the proprietor. Instead of intervening, the local police contributed derisive comments which amused the hoodlums. The climax came in December, when a riot was staged and the state police had to be called to the scene. According to Look, the police again sympathized with the mob and a patrolman shouted to Sumpf: “Why don’t you close this filthy joint?” Since he was unprotected by the authorities, Kurt Sumpf finally had to sell his business, and he eventually took a job as a taxi driver in Frankfurt.

The Koeppern story would have remained unrecorded had not a reporter of the Frankfurter Rundschau taken an interest in the case. Reporter Botho Kirsch at first tried to mediate in order to avoid “unfavorable publicity.” It was only when he saw that the Sumpfs were refused protection by the mayor, the pastor, the school principal, and the local and state police that he proceeded with publication. Then the Hessian Ministry of the Interior tried to hush up the case and to excuse the guilty policemen.

The publicity which the Koeppern case received inside Germany and abroad resulted in an investigation. Eleven persons were brought to trial, ranging in age from twenty-one to fifty-three, among them a policeman and a Bundeswehr soldier. The defendants were charged with having made anti-Semitic remarks, assaulting the Sumpfs, and having committed a breach of the peace. The Frankfurt court acquitted six of them “for lack of evidence,” four received fines from
seven to fifty dollars, and one was jailed for four months.

Anti-Semitic incidents like the Zind affair in Offenburg and the outburst in Koeppern cannot be dismissed as isolated cases. During 1958 the German papers reported numerous such flare-ups, some of them almost identical to the Koeppern case. The Frankfurter Rundschau of June 14, 1958, gave details about similar riots in Floersheim against the innkeeper Brauman, whose wife, a “half Jew,” was called a “Jewish pig” and was threatened with death. The Braumans were regarded as “undesirable,” and the police refused to give them protection.

Mr. Korry pointed out in Look that “for the past few months, it has been almost impossible to open a serious German newspaper without finding some reference to anti-Semitism.” Local German law-enforcement officials, instead of making every effort to combat these occurrences of racial hatred with stern measures, were in most cases remiss in their duties and often were participants in the anti-Semitic persecution. Such involvement on the part of the authorities was true in the case of a Jewish writer and critic, Siegfried Einstei

In February 1959 the New York Times reported from Bonn that another anti-Semitic incident had been instigated by a tax official and a former SS officer. Both men had used insulting remarks, and a criminal libel suit had been initiated by the respected Social Democratic Bundestag Deputy Jeanette Wolff (whose two daughters had been killed in a concentration camp and whose husband had been shot by the SS). According to the Times report, Frau Wolff stated in her complaint that “the tax official had said concentration camps were desirable and too few Jews had been killed in them. She also testified that the former SS leader had publicly threatened to use a riding whip in the same way as he said he had done before on naked Jewish women.”

In January 1959, four weeks before Dr. Adenauer announced that anti-Semitism had “disappeared,” Germany was stirred by several other occurrences, each one as serious as the Koeppern case. In Frankfurt the State Prosecutor, Dr. Otto Schweinsberger, was suspended for anti-Semitic statements and discrimination against Jews.4 In another case, several officials of a restitution court in Wiesbaden handling Jewish claims had made insulting remarks to the Jewish petitioners; they had deliberately sabotaged cases, and had amused themselves by staging office parties livened with anti-Semitic Nazi songs. The officials were dismissed under public pressure.

On January 28, 1959, the New York Daily News, in a special dispatch from Berlin, reported one of the “worst anti-Semitic demonstrations since the war.” Hoodlums, organized by a secret anti-Jewish underground, had staged disturbances during a play showing Nazi terrorism in the Warsaw ghetto. The demonstrators “threw stink bombs, shouted anti-Semitic slogans, and scuffled with the audience.”

The incident was not reported in the German press. The official Press Department in Bonn, operating under Felix von Eckardt, has developed an elaborate system for stifling reports of such events. The Zind affair, the Koeppern case, and many other incidents were kept out of the press for months. How the system works was neatly shown by an editorial in the Rheinischer Merkur, which severely reprimanded the school authorities for having allowed the Zind case to become public. The paper stated “that the scandal and trial could have been avoided if the authorities had com-
pelled Zind to make an apology and then would have given the teacher a job in another town." This declaration would indicate that Bonn is not so much concerned with anti-Semitism as it is with the unfortunate exposures of its existence.

It has been reported that "the old Nazi teachers and professors have all returned to the schools and universities." In January 1959 the Minister of Education in the State of Schleswig-Holstein suspended a junior college teacher, Otto Stielau, because he had made anti-Semitic remarks in connection with The Diary of Anne Frank. In another case, the Jewish community in Berlin finally dropped charges against a high school teacher on the occasion of the Christian-Jewish brotherhood week. The teacher had lost his job because he had stated in a restaurant that "all Jews should have been gassed." 9

Anti-Semitic outbursts had reached such proportions during 1958 that early in January 1959 the Central Jewish Council petitioned Chancellor Adenauer "to take immediate legal steps." Within a few days the Bonn government had hastily introduced a new law in the Bundestag which stipulated that expressions of hatred against racial or religious minorities would be punished with prison sentences of not less than three months. A week later the New York Times reported that this on one article alone, Die Welt had received "letters in response which would fill a medium-sized book." According to the Times dispatch, there was almost unanimous agreement that "the situation is alarming." 10

Bonn, already embarrassed by criticism abroad, faced a growing discussion in the responsible German press about the lenient attitude of the courts toward anti-Semitic offenses. The Suddeutsche Zeitung, in an editorial of January 24, 1959, pointed out that there was some kind of "latent anti-Semitism" within the machinery of justice. Finally the Bonn government was compelled to take sterner measures. Instead of small fines or suspended sentences, the courts began to send anti-Jewish troublemakers to jail. Here are some cases recorded during the first two months of 1959:

A court in Herford gave Carl Krumsiek, a textile salesman, seven months for having said it was "a pity all Jews weren't gassed by the Nazis." 16

A sanatorium attendant in Bavaria was given a three-month sentence for having said: "If there were still death camps in Germany I would volunteer to put the remaining Jews under gas." 17

A metal dealer in Hersfeld got two months in prison for anti-Semitic insults and threats. 18

A court in Mulheim ordered a clerk jailed without bail for having publicly praised the Nazi atrocities. He had ini-
sulted a Jew by calling him a "kike whom Hitler had forgotten to gas." The defendant had hinted that he would escape as Zind had. 29

It is not difficult to understand why—even with only a few thousand Jews left in Germany—these extreme anti-Semitic statements are so frequently heard. During Hitler’s days millions yelled in chorus, "Juda Verrecke!"—the Jew must perish. Today many Germans throughout the social strata still resent the fact that their country is not jüdenrein.

A housewife in Passau was fined two hundred marks for having called a neighbor a "dirty Jewish pig." 21 An engineer was sentenced to four months for having regretted that Hitler was not around "to gas the last of the Jews." 22 A policeman in Augsburg was suspended after having told a bartender: "Wait until the Adenauer era is over, then you and the other Jewish pigs will all be gassed." 23

Several hundred cases of desecration of Jewish cemeteries have occurred in recent years, but these were seldom reported in the press. The otherwise very efficient German police have been unable to track down the vandals. At times the authorities have given ridiculous explanations for their lack of success: the demolition of up to a hundred heavy tombstones was ascribed to eight-year-old children. 24 In another instance, the police callously stated that the destruction of Jewish graveyards was "caused by a storm." Frequent cases of defacement of synagogues—smearing of swastikas in red and white paint on the doors—have also remained unsolved. Chancellor Adenauer, answering a letter of protest from the American Jewish Committee, had this explanation: "Anti-Semtic acts are inspired by Communist agents." 25

Another form of anti-Semitism, reminiscent of the Hitler days, finds its expression in vicious anti-Jewish publications. In recent years a few publishers of anti-Semitic pamphlets have been given prison terms. In September 1959 a court in Hannover sentenced Arthur Goetze to nine months in prison for publishing libelous brochures and leaflets against Jews. 26

In January 1959 the prosecutor in Munich started an investigation of the anti-Jewish hate peddler, Guido Roeder, who had for many years published and circulated the notorious Protocols of the Elders of Zion and other anti-Semitic pamphlets. At the same time the Jewish Central Council launched a criminal libel action against a Nuremberg evening paper which had published a story about an alleged "Jewish ritual murder." 27

In May 1959 a trial lasting several days was held before the highest Federal Court in Karlsruhe. The defendant was Hans Robert Kremer, publisher and editor of the neo-Nazi periodical Die Anklage. The editor was charged with activities endangering the security of the state and undermining the constitution. There was a long list of specific offenses, such as abusive criticism of the democratic order, insults against the Bonn government, and the branding of the resistance fighters as "traitors." Herr Kremer openly proposed the re-establishment of a Nazi party and stated that democrats would be taken care of with summary justice on X day. Die Anklage was full of anti-Semitic material, frequently contributed by one of the most fanatical hatemongers of the old Goebbels staff, Dr. Johannes von Leers. In letters to the editor—often signed with "Heil Hitler!"—old Nazis threatened revenge in such statements as "Let us keep the knives sharp for the day when we will hang the Jews by their legs and then split open their bellies." 28 Similar scurrilous matter was published without hindrance over a period of four years, until the court finally caught up with Kremer and sentenced him to a two-year prison term.

Nor are these sentiments confined to the obvious rabble-rousers. Cases of open anti-Semitic bias have been found in recent years in the Bundeswehr and among the highest officials in the Bonn Foreign Office. In a litigation before a
Bonn court, the issue of anti-Jewish bias played a central role. An export merchant, Joachim Hertslet, charged that the Secretary of State Walter Hallstein and Ambassador Wilhelm Melchers “had denounced him to Arab governments as a Jew [which he is not], and had thereby seriously harmed his business connections in the Near and Middle East.” In another court case, witnesses confirmed the fact that the German diplomat Hans von Saucken insulted the New York correspondent of the Neue Zuercher Zeitung by calling him a “dirty Jew.” Under pressure from many sides, Herr von Saucken had to be dismissed.

In 1957 a biased and unproved statement by Minister Schaeffer about the drain on German finances because of restitution payments gave welcome propaganda ammunition to the anti-Semites. The majority of German people feel no regret for the crimes committed against millions of Jews, but believe instead that “world Jewry” is engaged in a plot to swindle the innocent Germans out of billions of marks. Kurt R. Grossman, a writer on German affairs, reported after a lengthy survey that “a casual perusal of various German publications yields article after article hammering away at the same theme: The Jews have willfully exaggerated the figures of Jewish deaths in order to secure more restitution.”

On February 14, 1958, the Social Democrats in the Bundestag demanded an investigation of the CDU member Jakob Diel, who reportedly had written in a letter to Dr. Adenauer that “in the opinion of the German people it is regrettable that all Jews had not been gassed, for in that case Germany would not have to make restitution.” Requests for restitution to victims of Nazi persecution are depicted as a “racket played by a bunch of greedy Jewish lawyers.” Discussing this subject, the Finance Minister Etzel “voiced his shock over the wave of intense anti-Semitism which he found expressed in the flood of letters protesting against the restitution arrangement.” The Minister of Edu-

Outbursts involving the desecration of graveyards and houses of worship, insults against Jews, and swastika-daubings, even in communities entirely free of Jews, occurred in 1954, 1957, and 1958. On Christmas Eve, 1959, the newly rebuilt synagogue in Cologne was defaced with huge swastikas and the words “Out with the Jews!” It was the signal for an epidemic outburst of swastika-daubings and vandalism in Germany and many other countries throughout the world. Within a period of six weeks the Ministry of the Interior registered 850 cases of anti-Semitic vandalism in widely separated areas in West Germany. The whole gamut of Nazi hooliganism was exhibited—from the scrawling of “Death to the Jews” and “Germany Awake” to desecration of graveyards, threatening letters to Jews, and the smashing of shop windows. The directorate of the Central Council of Jews in Germany declared that the excesses “evoke pictures that bring to mind the November days of 1938.” This reference was to the infamous “Kristallnacht”—the night of the broken glass—when synagogues were burned and Jewish houses were smashed to bits.

Although the arrest of two perpetrators gave clear proof that the anti-Semitic outbursts had been initiated by members of the neo-Nazi German Reichs party, Dr. Adenauer’s government again hastened to counteract foreign criticism by declaring that the incidents were Communist-inspired. This was immediately contradicted by the Social Democratic opposition and by experts in Dr. Adenauer’s own party. Professor Franz Boehm, a leading Christian Democratic deputy in the Bundestag, declared it a “dangerous self-delusion to
assume that Communists were masterminding the incidents." According to Professor Boehm, "the outbursts appeared to be synchronized acts of fascist elements throughout West Germany." 35 The Rheinischer Merkur published an entire page of material taken from neo-Nazi publications, which clearly showed the extreme Rightist politicians as the ideological arsonists behind the anti-Semitic campaign. 36

The effort to shift the blame onto the Communists was a clever attempt to find an acceptable scapegoat so that the Germans might be absolved of any responsibility. Adenauer's story was repudiated by the Social Democrats as "nonsense." The editor of the party's English-language newsletter, Heinz Putzrath, told an American correspondent that Adenauer was afraid to acknowledge the facts because he "doesn't want to offend the Right and lose it as a solid voting bloc." 37

Although more than 500 incidents had been investigated by the end of January, the Interior Ministry in Bonn was unable to present a single piece of evidence proving Communist complicity. The Interior Minister of North Rhine-Westphalia, after investigating 154 incidents in his state, told reporters he had "no evidence that East German Communists or Soviet groups had directly instigated any of the incidents in West Germany." 38

Most German and foreign observers agreed that the vandalistic acts were chiefly the work of well-organized groups. The police chief of Frankfurt, Dr. Littmann, was firmly convinced that most of the incidents "were carried out according to a central plan." 39 No doubt there were a number of pranksters and psychotics who participated as amateurs. Unquestionably, however, most of the slogan-smearing and swastika-daubing was done by paint-brush experts.

The swastika campaign was obviously activated by the belief that the time had come to show the masses that Nazism was still alive. According to a report in the New York Herald Tribune, large factions of the German public were in open sympathy with the vandals. "News correspondents heard West Germans suggesting that the Jews 'must have done something' if their synagogues were being desecrated in various parts of the world." 40 The same report pointed out that "a large part of the West German people remain poisoned by anti-Semitism. This is part of the fabric of West German life, and it is evident, day by day and out to foreign observers in this country. No change from this state of affairs is in sight."

With the adverse impact on public opinion abroad, the Bonn government was compelled to take measures to stop the anti-Semitic vandalism. After a few months it petered out. Yet the danger of a relapse is still present. A United Press report from Bonn quoted government officials and Jewish leaders as saying that "anti-Semitism is dormant but not dead." One Interior Ministry official stated: "One can never say such an outbreak will not occur again." 41

How much of a danger is the anti-Jewish sentiment in Germany today? A public opinion poll made in 1958 (the latest at the moment of writing) showed that "39 percent of the Germans were definitely anti-Semitic," 29 percent were "conditionally anti-Semitic," 25 percent showed no anti-Semitic attitudes, and only 7 percent were described as "philosemitic." 42 The study confirmed what many observers had long suspected—that "the highest percentage of anti-Semitism exists in the rural areas, particularly in small towns." This is borne out by the solid anti-Semitism manifested in towns like Offenburg, Lampertheim, and Koeppern.

It has often been argued that not too much emphasis should be placed on incidents such as I have cited in this chapter—that other countries have their share of cranks, racists, and criminals, and that it would be unfair to burden Germany as

* When releasing this survey in 1958, the American Jewish Committee, "despite the democratic political structure in Germany," saw danger of a "revival of racially motivated nationalism and anti-Semitism."
a nation with the misdeeds of a “minority” or a few political maniacs.

First, anti-Semitism is not a minority belief in Germany, but is still part of a Weltanshauung cherished by the majority. Second, there is a great difference between the milder forms of social and political anti-Jewish sentiments found in other countries and the anti-Semitism in Germany. The conviction that the Jews must be exterminated and that the living “should have been gassed” is evidence that German anti-Semites identify themselves even today with the Nazi outlook.

With nearly 70 percent of the population overtly or covertly anti-Semitic, it might seem almost a miracle that the Adenauer administration has been able to keep these sentiments relatively under control. But politically the Germans are a well-trained people. They have demonstrated during the twenties and the fifties that they can “behave,” or rather that they can deceive das Ausland—the (gullible) foreigners. At the moment, circumstances compel them to play the role of a democratic people. But we must guard against the false assumption that the masses of the Germans have undergone a profound change of heart. Kurt R. Grossmann, after his lengthy discussions on the anti-Semitic problem with officials in Bonn, reported that the then President Heuss “admitted that the old hatreds still prevail, and agreed that the educational processes to battle these evils must be greatly intensified.”

12 The Other Germany

Is there “another Germany,” set apart from the millions of militarists, ex-Hitlerites, storm troopers, SS butchers, and Deutschland-ueber-Alles nationalists?

Yes, there is. Rather, there are “other Germans.” There are many politically mature and humane Germans who feel a burning shame about the crimes committed by Germany as a nation. There are many courageous Germans who are trying again, as in the twenties, to stem a tide which some day might throw Germany and the world into another catastrophe.

The riddle of the “other Germany”—and the often quoted “two souls” in every Teutonic breast—has baffled and intrigued foreign observers and German thinkers alike for more than a century. Goethe, Heine, Hoelderlin, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche were plagued by the uneasy feeling that Germany’s irrational romanticism and militaristic barbarism would one day lead to a revolt against Western civilization. These cultural leaders had no great hope for the other Germany. It was the poet Heinrich Heine who, in 1834, pre-
dicted that the day would come when Germany "will run berserk" against the civilized world and that "the German thunder will crash as it has never yet crashed in the world's history." Heine feared that under the savagery of Teutonic barbarism "the Christian cross will come tumbling down in pieces." 1

There were others who foresaw the coming explosion. Toward the end of the last century a young educator and moral philosopher, who soon became a towering figure and the leading voice among the other Germans, predicted the coming upheaval with amazing accuracy. It was Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster who bluntly denounced Prussia's militaristic "blood and iron" policy in his magazine, Ethical Culture. In 1895 he was imprisoned for lese majesty and "criticism of the state." But Foerster's voice could not be silenced. During the First World War this fearless fighter spoke to tightly packed audiences at the University of Munich, denouncing the spirit of aggression and admonishing his young students to "abandon national egotism and join in a new European cultural order." Such ideas were condemned by the Munich faculty as national heresy which should "make every German ashamed." Soon Foerster came under censorship and all his lectures were verboten.

After the First World War, Foerster warned the Allies that they would lose the peace if they let themselves be fooled by the clever policy of dissemblance of the Weimar Republic, which hid the fact that the German war lords were preparing a new assault against Europe. When the German militarists threatened Foerster's life in 1923, he was forced to leave the country as an early exile. In his paper, Die Menschheit, Foerster continued to expose Germany's secret rearmament. On July 8, 1927, he printed this truly prophetic statement: "This much should at least be clear to us: The masters of Germany today need peace and want peace, but only in order to be armed on a date which will be decided by the weakness of her neighbors. That date will fall anywhere between 1933 and 1938." *

When the European statesmen were captivated by the "peace" siren songs of Germany's Foreign Minister Stresemann, Foerster wrote this realistic warning in Die Menschheit: "The leading German circles, with their battle cry of 'Deutschland, Deutschland ueber Alles,' are consciously pursuing their aim of a new European catastrophe. . . . As a prairie fire spreads over the dry grass, so Teutonic madness, inflamed by Prussianism, spreads unrestrained over the nation."

Foerster knew that there were thousands of peaceable, unmilitaristic Germans, but he felt that they were only a helpless minority, unable to assert political influence or leadership among their countrymen. To him this other Germany was like "a small boat tossed around by the waves of a storm-swept ocean of political madness."

Another German writer who saw clearly what was happening in his own country is Wilhelm Roepke, a university professor, today a supporter of Dr. Adenauer's policies. Professor Roepke described the spread of Nazism around 1930, three years before Hitler came to power:

Among our sensible peasants of Lower Saxony the Nazi activities were having really alarming success. There were very few people left with whom it was still possible to talk rationally. . . . Against this Nazi plague nothing seemed to avail, neither the appeal to common sense nor the moral appeal. . . . All classes were dosed with the poison in the most effective quantity and strength in each case, and everywhere every class was brought down, clerks, and mechanics with their employers, peasants and aristocrats, . . .

* In his more than two dozen books, Foerster not only appears as an important educator and politico-religious philosopher, but he has also given us the deepest insight into German thought and behavior. Familiarity with his main work, Europe and the German Question (New York, 1949), is essential for an understanding of the Pan-German mania and the policy of deception practiced by the "democratic" statesmen of the Weimar Republic.
professors, officers, industrialists, bankers, civil servants. The friend of yesterday turned overnight into one possessed, with whom it was no longer possible to argue, and the more the movement succeeded the more the nervous, the cynical, and the ambitious joined the genuinely convinced fanatics, the crazy, and the moral perverts. . . . It was from the universities that most of the other intellectuals drew the disintegrating poison that they then distributed, duly packed and processed, to the mass of the people. 2

What is the strength of the other Germany today and how great is its influence on the political life of the nation? The other Germany is there, fighting a heroic battle, but almost abandoned and in bitter despair. Compared to the time before the First World War and again during the Weimar Republic, more Germans today are conscious of the dangers that lie ahead. There is more active resistance against a new outbreak of German nationalistic mania, especially among the academic youth. In recent years German newspapers have printed an unusual number of letters to the editor protesting against the creeping renazification of the country.

Certain newspapers have given admirable support to the democratic cause by being alert and pointing out the dangers. Outstanding in this respect are the independent democratic dailies Sueddeutsche Zeitung and Frankfurter Rundschau. Among the periodicals, the monthlies Frankfurter Hefte and Der Monat deserve special mention.

Some of the more conservative dailies, such as the Frankfurter Allgemeine, the Deutsche Zeitung and Die Welt, have taken a firm stand against neo-Nazi and anti-Semitic incidents, but they seem to ignore completely the resurgence forces within the Adenauer government and its supporting parties. The great mass of the provincial newspapers are usually extremely nationalistic and are often staffed with editors who once served the Nazi press. For example, the publisher of six large provincial newspapers in Bavaria is Max Willmy, a one-time Nazi publisher who, together with Julius Streicher, owned the anti-Semitic weekly Der Stuermer. After the war Willmy was convicted as a "minor offender" and punished by a fine of 30,000 marks. 3 In 1959 one of Willmy's papers, the 8-Uhr-Blatt in Nuremberg, was in the news again for having published the fabricated story of a "Jewish ritual murder." 4

The highest praise is in order for the often heroic efforts by which individuals and small groups have battled the neo-Nazi and militaristic trends. Frequently, principled people sacrificed their positions rather than betray their democratic ideals. There is the case of Dr. Gustav Heinemann, a Protestant leader, who resigned from the Adenauer cabinet in protest against the restorative tendencies, the rearmament, and the high-handed, autocratic methods used by the Chancellor. Corvett Captain Werner Dobberstein, a Navy officer, tried for a long time to get action from his superiors against the growing pro-Nazi attitudes, the "Doenitz spirit," among the Navy officers. When he found his efforts were in vain, Captain Dobberstein, in 1956, wrote a letter to Defense Minister Theodor Blank, complaining about the unhealthy situation. Instead of ordering an investigation and backing up an alert and democratic-minded officer, Bonn ordered Dobberstein's dismissal a few days later (Die Zeit, May 17, 1956).

Another incident concerns the State Commissioner for Youth Guidance in Schleswig-Holstein, Dr. Ernst Hessenauer. Dr. Hessenauer told a meeting of students that he regarded it as unwholesome to the democratic process to permit former Nazi officials to run for public office or be appointed to responsible positions. He had stirred up a hornet's nest; he was immediately reprimanded and silenced by the Minister-President of Schleswig-Holstein.

One of the few democratic actions which ended successfully was launched in 1955 against the Minister of Education in the State of Lower Saxony. The appointment of Herr Leonard Schlueter—right-wing extremist and owner of a pro-Nazi publishing house—to a cabinet position stirred the aca-
ademic profession throughout Germany. The Rector of the University of Goettingen and nearly two dozen senior professors resigned, and a few thousand students went on strike. They marched in protest and demanded the ouster of Minister Schlueter. Public pressure forced Herr Schlueter first to go on "leave" and then to resign his office. The press reported that Dr. Adenauer was displeased because "mob action" had forced the ouster of a cabinet member.

In past years a small group of writers, newspapermen, and radio commentators have tried to confront the German public with some unpleasant truths. In an earlier chapter I mentioned the name of Michael Heinze-Mansfeld, a young journalist, who revealed that Dr. Adenauer's Foreign Ministry was staffed by dozens of former Nazis, some of them war criminals. On October 22, 1952, the Chancellor countered with an angry speech in the Bundestag stating that "such snooping in the Nazi records must be stopped." This demand from the leader of the nation had the effect of bringing the curtain down on the Nazi past.

As also mentioned earlier, a group of writers and journalists, the so-called Gruenwalder Circle, has done much to expose the activities of neo-Nazi publishers and writers. In 1959 an excellent series of articles was published by Thomas Gnulka in the Frankfurter Rundschau under the title "They Have Learned Nothing." It documented the far-flung network of neo-Nazi organizations and their growing influence on Germany's youth. As usual such revelations were dismissed by German authorities as alarmist or were branded by the Rightists as "Moscow-inspired."

A few years ago the gifted writer and critic, Erich Kuby, depicted the arrogant General Ramcke in a radio play, using him to demonstrate the criminal nature of Hitler's Wehrmacht. The play had its aftermath in a libel suit against the author, tried before a court in Hamburg. In a rare turnabout, the State Prosecutor sided with the author, and asked for dismissal of the case.

In the spring of 1957, eighteen leading atomic scientists in West Germany published a manifesto warning against the use of atomic bombs and giving their solemn pledge not to take part in any research or production of nuclear weapons. It was an almost revolutionary act, challenging the German philosophy of the unquestioned supremacy of the state and obedience from its academic servants. Dr. Adenauer answered the academic protest with an angry statement that arming with atom bombs was "a political question which should be of no concern to scientists because they are not qualified to judge such matters."

There is a long honor roll of religious leaders who have fearlessly spoken up against the trend toward renazification and remilitarization. Dr. Eugen Kogon, the editor of the Frankfurter Hefte, has been mentioned before. There is the Catholic paper Michael, outspoken in its criticism of the Nazi past and its latter-day disciples. There are Protestant leaders like the Reverend Dr. Gruber and Pastor Niemoeller, who have often admonished the German people to reform. There are pacifists like Dr. Klara-Marie Fassbinder, Fritz Kuester, and Otto Lehmann-Russbuehl, who have continuously raised their voices against the revival of German militarism. Praise must also go to those Protestants and Catholics who have made great strides in promoting Christian-Jewish relations. Admirable work has been done by Erich Lueth, Director of Press and Public Relations in Hamburg, who organized friendship trips to Israel and also arranged mass pilgrimages of thousands of German youth to honor the victims who died in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp.

Yet, in spite of the many courageous men and women who are fighting for a better Germany, this minority has little effect. The reality of the situation was made impressively
clear to me during extensive discussions I had with a highly respected German newspaperman. When I suggested that the student protests against the Minister of Education Schlueer and the manifesto of the eighteen atomic scientists had raised my hopes for a reconstructed and politically more mature Germany, this well-informed observer warned me emphatically against drawing the wrong conclusions from such isolated incidents. He pointed out that behind the democratic façade of the Bonn Republic the conservative-nationalistic Germany was reorganizing her forces. Here is how my informant analyzed the political trends in present-day Germany:

There are a variety of power factors and purposes at work in Germany's body politics. It would be oversimplification to judge things according to the party labels, such as "Christian Democrats" and "Social Democrats," or to differentiate between "Left" and "Right." There are only a few who deeply believe in a democratic constitution. Most Germans are still imbued with a nationalistic fanaticism, even if outwardly they appear politically indifferent. The majority are satisfied to be ruled by a "strong man," an undisguised autocrat. The Chancellor is backed by the industrial and financial oligarchy of Rhine and Ruhr and by the powerful Catholic Church. With a highly interlocked officialdom running the federal administration and the Christian Democratic Union, Dr. Adenauer has a first-class instrument for controlling the entire country, manipulating public opinion, and winning elections.

The Social Democrats have little chance of gaining a majority. In the nationalistic view of the voters, they are not stubenrein—not reliable; they are regarded as "un-German." •

* Under the Kaiser the Social Democrats were accused of being "traitors to the Fatherland"; in the Weimar Republic they were blamed for the "stab in the back" that allegedly brought Germany's defeat in World War I; at present they have been branded, even by Dr. Adenauer, as "unpatriotic" and "unreliable." Yet the fact is that the late Social Democratic leader, Kurt Schumacher, was extremely nationalistic, and so is a large Rightist faction of the party.

As long as the boom economy lasts, the Social Democrats will be supported by a third of the electorate, chiefly by union-conscious workers. But the majority of the nation will always back the conservative-Rightist coalition. Most observers believe that if there is a slump there will be a strong pull to the radical Right.

A trend toward the Left in West Germany is highly improbable, because the neo-Nazis and nationalist-activists make up at least 20 percent of the people. They set the pace for the indifferent masses. In case of a crisis they will have the backing of the industrialists, the government, the police, and the army. They will pull the majority of the people with them. The democratic-liberal Left is not strong enough to prevent another dictatorship; it represents less than 5 percent of the population. They write letters to the editor today, but they will not die on the barricades. They are individuals without leadership, and without a hope for the future.

Kurt P. Tauber, writing in the New York Times Magazine (December 27, 1959), stated that under Dr. Adenauer's leadership "has come the return to social, economic and political power of precisely those commercial and industrial elites who supported a megalomaniac imperialism under the Empire." These groups kept their privileges under Hitler and they are wielding power again today: "They do not much care whether they hold it under a monarchy, share it with a petty bourgeois dictatorship or wield it in a conservative republic." Mr. Tauber found that they remained "what they always were: fiercely anti-socialist, largely anti-democratic, authoritarian in their social views and habits of thought, opposed to what they call the excesses of party democracy. . . . They tend to be anti-Semitic in a generalized way and they are intensely patriotic."

The German bureaucrats, reported Mr. Tauber, "are today largely recruited from the same authoritarian-conservative circles as in the past. . . . To pretend that they have a deep commitment to the democratic state they are serving is egre-
gious nonsense. . . . The total absence of any inner relationship to the Bonn Republic gives rise to cynicism and apathy, and plays into the hands of those who wish to discredit the entire democratic process."

In spite of the large majorities that Adenauer polled in the elections, the Federal Republic enjoys no popularity among the masses. This was confirmed in a front-page editorial in the Frankfurter Allgemeine of May 14, 1958: "Nobody loves this republic, nobody shows her a friendly interest, and there are only a few who speak politely of her institutions and symbols."

Here then is the tragic situation of the so-called "other Germany": It is made up of a woefully small group of mature individuals, who are isolated and often bitterly despised and vilified by their own people. They are democrats without a democratic party; they are without a political home. Their potential contribution to the postwar German republic has never been nurtured. In fact, they have been almost completely ignored by the Allies from the beginning of the occupation.
PART THREE

Moral Insanity
In 1956 the Hamburg lumber merchant Friedrich Nieland published an anti-Jewish brochure entitled *How Many World (Money) Wars Do Nations Have To Lose?* Nieland's tract spoke of "the enormous lie about the gassing and slaughter of six million Jews." Germans, declared Herr Nieland, "are by their very nature unable to commit such brutal crimes." He then charged that "the entire maneuver of destruction was initiated by secret representatives of international Jewry."* Having relieved the Germans of all guilt, Herr Nieland warned that international Jewry is "plotting the extermination of the white race in a third world war," and insisted that "no Jew should sit in any important position, be it in the government, political parties, banking or elsewhere."

Two thousand copies of the brochure were mailed to all deputies of the German Bundestag and the Laender parliaments, and to officials in the ministries. Almost a year went by before one of the recipients requested an investigation.

*This shifting of blame for the mass gassing of millions of people to the "secret representatives of international Jewry" has been echoed in the neo-Nazi and expellee press, as well as in the *Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung.*
The public prosecutor in Hamburg saw neither libel nor danger to the state and therefore refused to sustain an indictment. The court reasoned that Nieland's attack was directed only against international Jewry, not against the Jewish people. On January 6, 1959, the Hanseatic Supreme Court rejected the prosecutor's appeal, thereby granting Herr Nieland legal immunity to give his brochure mass circulation. Within a few days the Nieland case caused an uproar in the press—both democratic and conservative—which centered the public interest on the whole judicial system.

The presiding judge in the criminal court that had first decided in favor of author Nieland was Dr. Enno Budde, a jurist whose unsavory political record was soon revealed in several leading newspapers. Dr. Budde, as a young law student, had been a fierce fighter against the Weimar Republic. In his antidemocratic actions Budde had often overstepped the limits of what was permitted under the very lenient Weimar regime. Yet this enemy of democracy was later appointed a judge in the Weimar Republic.

The Nazi victory in 1933 brought fulfillment to Judge Budde's nationalistic longings. In several articles he had praised the racial laws against the Jews and hailed Hitler as the outstanding protector and purifier of the Teutonic people. It was this Dr. Enno Budde, enemy of the republic, anti-Semite, and admirer of Hitler, whom the Bonn administration appointed as the presiding judge over the Verfassungsrichterkammer—the Court for the Protection of the Constitution. Dr. Budde proved to be a strange guardian of the law. There were a number of cases in which he acquitted SS men accused of brutal crimes in concentration camps. On other occasions this Nazi judge openly demonstrated his sympathy for the Gestapo by showing them extraordinary leniency.†

* The circulation of the brochure was later stopped by another court action.
† "Enno Budde—Richter aus Blut und Boden," Frankfurter Rundschau, Jan-

One of Germany's leading journalists, Dr. Paul Sethe, wrote a long editorial in which he stated bluntly that the Nieland-Budde affair could not be regarded as unique. Bonn's judicial system, Sethe contended, was still dominated by the spirit of the twenties which had caused the downfall of the Weimar Republic and had paved the way for Hitler. "We believe," said the editorial, "that this miscarriage of justice [eine schlimme Fehlentscheidung] would never have occurred if the judges had had some of the stench of the Auschwitz crematoria in their nostrils." Dr. Sethe suggested a thorough investigation of the political past of all judges who had participated in the decision. The editorial ended despairingly: "We are outraged and sorrowful; we feel ashamed, deeply ashamed."  

The German judiciary has posed problems since the early postwar years when the victorious Allies tried to reorganize the courts.* In Bavaria, which supposedly was "denazified" under the American occupation, the courts have been staffed with the old Nazi law officers. It has been reported that "as many as 85 percent of the judges have Nazi records."  

Because of America's preoccupation with German rearmament, very little attention has been paid by the U.S. press to the conditions in the German judiciary. In Europe, however, leading papers have frequently sounded alarms. An experienced observer of the German scene, Brian Connell, former chief of the Daily Mail bureau in Germany and later foreign affairs correspondent of the News Chronicle, has told in his book A Watcher on the Rhine of "hair-raising cases" in which Gestapo and Waffen SS mass murderers were acquitted in January 19 and 20, 1959. Because of the strong criticism of the press, Budde was soon quietly transferred to a court dealing with rent control and real estate cases.

* This chapter on the German judiciary is based on several thousand press reports on German war crimes and court cases which I have collected over the last twelve years.
 spite of overwhelming evidence, even in instances where the accused had “blithely admitted” their guilt. Mr. Connell traced the frequent acquittal of Nazi war criminals to the fact that there is “little ideological difference between a judiciary partly staffed by ex-Nazis and the accused.”

An editorial in Die Welt stated that the German judiciary is unable to deal with the Nazi past: “It can be said that the misdeeds committed in the concentration camps and death factories could have been prosecuted much earlier if the German judiciary and administration had not been staffed with judges and bureaucrats whose own shirts are not free from dark spots and who, therefore, secretly sympathize with the culprits of the Nazi regime.”

The Nieland-Budde affair turned the spotlight on many more judges and prosecutors who had been appointed to important positions in the Bonn judiciary. On January 22, 1959, the Bundestag had a debate on the subject. The Social Democratic opposition charged that the Adenauer administration had failed to screen high officials, had been too eager to close the files of the Nazi past, and had not presented a full documentation of the crimes committed in the concentration camps.

In numerous newspaper articles, political and legal experts agreed that conditions in the judiciary were lamentable, to say the least. And it was a high law enforcement officer, Prosecutor General Max Guede, who had the courage to point to the most sensitive spot in the German judiciary—the Nazi past of thousands of German judges and prosecutors. In a lecture before the Evangelical Academy in Bad Boll, on October 19, 1958, Dr. Guede declared that judges should become conscious of the fact that they “were all guilty of having betrayed the idea of justice” and that, by serving the Nazis, they had become “tools of injustice and instruments of terror.”

*Frankfurter Allgemeine, October 29, 1958. Dr. Guede supported his statement with a frightful statistic. During the four and one-half years of the First World War, the German courts, by stern application of severe laws, sentenced altogether 141 civilians to death. During the Second World War, Hitler’s judges sent at least 16,000 civilians to the gallows in Germany alone. The ratio in the military courts was: First World War, 48 executions; Second World War, 6,000 executions.*

The German authorities had created special laws of terror in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other conquered countries. Everywhere German judges sent innocent people by the tens of thousands to the gallows or before the firing squads. The court records, still available, show them not as guardians of the law, but as “a legal terror squad,” helping to establish “German order” over the world. It was these judges who kept Hitler’s hangmen and the firing squads busy until the end of the war. The German press showed that death sentences were often given for the slightest infractions of German occupation rules:

- For a critical remark.
- For slaughtering a pig without a permit.
- For stealing some bread.
- For violating a curfew law.
- For singing a verboten song.
- For giving a cigarette to a prisoner.
- For sheltering a six-year-old Jewish child for a few hours.
- To a Pole for allegedly “hurting a German police dog.”
- To a German bank director for having “expressed doubts about the ultimate victory.”
- To a Catholic priest for having made a political joke.
- To a German for having relations with a Jewish woman.
- To a Polish servant girl for having been “disobedient” to her German mistress.

These few examples, taken at random, could be multiplied by hundreds. In cases where no witness or no evidence was
presented, the judges declared that the accused “was capable” of being antagonistic to German aims. Der Spiegel called these court procedures “remarkable cases of legal lynching.”

In an article, “Nazis in the German Judiciary,” the Manchester Guardian Weekly reported that “around 360,000 Czechs died during the Nazi occupation between 1939 and 1945; many of them were judicially murdered.” With 2,000 German legal officials having served in Czechoslovakia, the paper believes that there is an urgent need “for a large-scale investigation of the entire West German judiciary.”

According to newspaper reports, 17 of Hitler's former judges hold office today in Germany's highest tribunal, the Federal Court at Karlsruhe; 27 others are presidents or directors of provincial courts. A judge of the Federal Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe, Wilhelm Ellinghaus, recently declared: “The worst thing is, it seems to me, that hundreds of former military judges who condemned thirty thousand people to death mainly for trifles, are today back on the benches.”

Here are the profiles of a few judges and prosecutors whose records have been cited in Der Spiegel and elsewhere in the press.

Dr. Ernst Kanter: known as the “hanging judge” in occupied Denmark; sentenced several hundred persons to death. Earlier, in Germany, he had condemned dozens of “enemies of the state” to death or hard labor. In 1950 he was put in charge of a department in the Federal Ministry of Justice. In 1958 he was appointed Senate President at the Federal Court in Karlsruhe, the equivalent of a U. S. Supreme Court judge.

Dr. Konrad Roediger: former legal expert in the Foreign Office; was implicated by documents and linked with the

cutor General Guede said: “These photostats were made from original documents. I checked these sentences and I am shocked.”

liquidation of millions of Jews. He serves today as a high judge at the Federal Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe.

Dr. Eisele: notorious Nazi terror judge in Prague; was returned by U.S. authorities to Czechoslovakia to stand trial as a war criminal. When released, after serving five years in prison, he was appointed director of the Upper Provincial Court in Stuttgart. Under mounting criticism he was finally suspended in 1959.

Dr. Otto Schweinsberger: served as military judge in the East; sentenced dozens of people to be executed for minor violations of occupation rules. He became Senior Prosecutor in Frankfurt despite his Nazi record. He was suspended from office December 1958, and later retired.

Dr. Werner Rhode: was known as a fanatical Nazi prosecutor before a special court in Prague; asked for dozens of death sentences for persons accused of being “enemies of the Reich.” Today he serves as head of a department in the Ministry of Justice in Schleswig-Holstein. His name has been linked with several judicial scandals in that state.

Dr. Rehder-Knoespel: once Chief Prosecutor in Prague; was called “the hangman” for his ruthless persecution of Czech patriots. On February 8, 1944, he demanded the death sentence for seven Czechs for having given food to a Soviet prisoner. One of the executed was a pregnant woman. He functions today as Senior Public Prosecutor in Mannheim.

Dr. Muhs: was president of a special court in Poland (Radom); left his mark there with many death sentences. He once condemned a Pole for having sheltered a Jewish child. He is today presiding judge at the Upper Provincial Court in Hamm.

Dr. Bruchhaus: has a notorious record as Hitler's overeager prosecutor in Poland; asked for the death sentence for a Dr. Neubeck for “being capable of hatred against Germany.” He is today a prosecutor at the Provincial Court in Wuppertal.
Dr. Hucklenbroich: was presiding judge at a special court in Poznan; according to Der Spiegel, he "chopped off heads at the order of his Fuehrer." For "hostility to Germany" or stealing a piece of luggage, he imposed the death sentence. He serves today as senior judge at the Provincial Court in Wuppertal.

Dr. Reimers: was once presiding judge of the Appeals Court in Czechoslovakia; practiced "legal lynching" on a large scale. He serves today as judge at the Provincial Court in Ravensburg.

Dr. Arthur Neumann: Nazi judge of a military court; wrote his wife during the war that he was "proud to have earned the name the 'bloody judge.'" He became Senate President of the Provincial Court in Berlin (Die Zeit, December 12, 1957).

Dr. Harry von Rosen-Hoewel: was professor of law; in 1942 advocated the conquest of Lebensraum in the East through "special treatment of Poles and Jews." Today he serves as Senior Federal Prosecutor at the Oberverwaltungsgericht—a high administrative court.

Dr. Franz Schlueter: was one of Hitler's judges in Czechoslovakia and later in Austria; on April 28, 1945, he dispatched seventeen people at once to the execution block. In his denazification procedure Dr. Schlueter denied any guilt, but the presiding judge fined him 50,000 marks and stated: "Never before has a defendant appeared before this court who has told so many lies." In 1950, Dr. Schlueter became a high official in the Federal Ministry of Justice. Later he was appointed to an important position at the Federal Patent Office in Munich (Frankfurter Rundschau, July 1, 1957).

The "honor role" of the German judiciary would make a lengthy list. To the embarrassment of the Bonn government, a committee in East Germany published the names and records of more than one thousand military judges and prosecutors who had staffed Hitler's legal terror squads in the East and who now dispense justice in the Federal Republic. The Bonn government has until now kept all official records of Nazi judges and bureaucrats under lock and key.

In fairness it must be stated that not all judges and prosecutors permitted themselves to serve the Nazi regime. It certainly was not easy to dispense justice under Hitler, but there were ways and means of remaining honorable, even if one had to risk the scorn of the big and little tyrants. Some judges retired, others used a kind of legal guerrilla warfare against the system. Such judges often sent the accused to prison for three to five years in order to keep them from being caught by the Gestapo and sent to the death camps of the SS. But these judges remained a pitiful minority. Even today this minority does not have the power or influence to enforce a general reformation of their profession. A courageous jurist like Dr. Guede has met considerable criticism from his colleagues.

Attempts have been made to pin the blame exclusively on Hitler and the "Nazi laws." The truth is that many German law officials have always shown a proclivity toward a callous disregard for justice and decency. The roots of this attitude reach deep into the German past. The judges and prosecutors in imperial Germany were known to be arrogant; they posed blatantly as the protectors of the ruling groups and were far removed from democratic concepts. Klassenjustiz was the term often used to characterize the judiciary of that period.

With the collapse of the monarchy in 1918, the German judges were taken over by the republic and not one law official was dismissed. The overwhelming majority of judges and prosecutors felt a burning hatred and contempt for the Weimar Republic, its representatives, and its institutions. The law was used to harass and vilify the supporters of the democratic system, and to protect the monarchists, the political saboteurs, and the Nazi street fighters and murder gangs.

Wilhelm Roepke has testified to the hostility of German
students toward labor groups. He himself was present when some students "kidnapped fifteen workmen from a neighboring village and murdered them while under transport." The reason: "shot while attempting to escape." The perpetrators of the crime "remained unpunished," and those who had testified in court earned "the hatred and anger of the dominant groups of professors and students in the university." According to Professor Roepke, the students and the professors of law were the worst of them all:

In Germany there were indeed few faculties of law that were not filled with the spirit of obdurate antiliberalism, antidemocratism, nationalism and anti-Semitism, and it was this spirit that was thus carried into the life of the country by those who later became judges, administrative officials, and lawyers. 

Hitler's coming to power was acclaimed by these nationalistic judges and prosecutors. According to the aforementioned Judge Ellinghaus, the great majority of law officials became Nazi party members in 1933. The most fanatical and ruthless volunteered for the honor of becoming instruments of terror. These judges were appointed to sit on People's Courts, military courts, or special courts, where they competed with the SS in destroying enemies of the state and in liquidating the Jews. They ruthlessly decimated the Slavic nations in order to conquer Lebensraum for the German master race.

The majority of German judges have always served "the law" and the powers-in-being. Judges, prosecutors, and administrators—the Globkes, Kanters, and Buddes—like to pose as legal experts and technicians. They prefer to serve autocrats and they are eager to seize power, but they refuse to assume responsibility for their conduct and action. In every system of government they are "indispensable." They were indispensable to the Kaiser, and after 1918 to the Weimar Republic. In 1933 they became indispensable to the Nazis, and after 1945 to the occupying powers. In 1949 they became indispensable to the Bonn Republic. They will again become indispensable on some future day when a new "strong man" has appeared on the German scene.
When Adolf Hitler committed suicide in the bunker of his bombed-out Chancellery in April 1945, he left behind him a fanatical leadership corps which, in numbers and training, was without precedent in recorded history. What has happened to the several hundred thousand men who represented the elite of the Nazi party?

Let us take a look at the German police. Frequent complaints have been made by the democratic opposition that key posts in the police hierarchy of the larger states, such as North Rhine-Westphalia, Schleswig-Holstein, and Bavaria, have been swamped with former SS officers and Gestapo officials. It has been reported that many of them "had forged their records to conceal their Nazi past." On October 16, 1959, the Social Democrats complained that twenty SS officers had wormed their way into top police positions in the State of North Rhine-Westphalia. They named specifically the chiefs of the Criminal Divisions in such cities as Cologne, Dortmund, and Essen. It was pointed out that these former Gestapo officials had conspired with the Nazis in the dying days of the Weimar Republic. The Socialists charged that the whole police organization is dominated by a clique of former Nazis who see to it that promotions and appointments are awarded to reliable SS men.

In March 1959 the government of Baden-Wuerttemberg reported to the Diet that 152 former Gestapo officials were in the service of the state police and that 215 others received state pensions. The chief of the Criminal Department in the city of Stuttgart is the former Gestapo official Dobritz, who was sentenced to death in absentia by a French court for torture and manslaughter.

During the last two years, a number of high police officials were arrested and charged with being implicated in Gestapo murder cases. The police captain Friedrich Simon, of Gelsenkirchen, was charged with the shooting of 20 concentration camp prisoners. In April 1959 the State Prosecutor launched an investigation of 23 police officers in the city of Berlin, all suspected of having been involved in the mass murder of 97,000 Jews in Bialystok, Poland. In July 1959 the chief of the Criminal Division of the Palatinate state police, Dr. Georg Heuser, was arrested and charged with the liquidation of thousands of Jews in the city of Minsk, Poland. An important official in the state government of Lower Saxony, Gerhard Schneider, once commander of an SS terror task force, was charged with having ordered mass executions in Poland and Russia. The head of the Criminal Department in the city of Saarbruecken, the former Gestapo official Klemmer, was arrested in 1959. He admitted having ordered mass executions in the East. In January 1960 the Interior Minister of Hesse announced the arrest of the chief of the State Criminal Division, Police Commissioner Georg Lothar Hoffmann. He was charged with having committed mass liquidations in the Maidanek concentration camp in Poland. A top official in the Criminal Department of the state police in Hanover, Bodo Struck, was charged with having participated in the murder of 95,000 Jews in a district in the East.
dispatch in the New York Times reported the suspension of the chief of the Bonn Criminal Police Force, Dr. Hans Maly. He was charged with “having misapplied the law while a member of the Nazi Security Police.”

For many years police officers involved in mass executions had little to fear from the courts. Their standard explanation was that they had acted “on orders” and were “not conscious of wrongdoing.” This was often sufficient to obtain an acquittal. Criminal Inspector Ewald Sudau of Minden, a former Gestapo official, was charged with the killing of 150 Jews. He was acquitted for “lack of evidence.” Charges were dropped against “250 German policemen accused of murdering 20,000 Jews in Lithuania and Russia in 1941.” Their defense was that “they themselves would have been killed if they had refused to carry out the executions.”

The appointment of former SS officers to responsible positions in the Bonn Verfassungsschutz—the Office for the Protection of the Constitution—has been mentioned earlier. This policy has caused sharp comments in the democratic section of the German press. The chief of the Internal Security Department in the Interior Ministry, the German FBI, is Dr. Rudolf Toyka; he was a member of the Nazi party from 1935 to 1945.

Bonn’s super-cloak-and-dagger service is headed by Hitler’s former Intelligence chief, General Reinhard Gehlen. The Bureau Gehlen is staffed with 4,000 former SS officers and SD (security) agents.

The filling of sensitive law-enforcement and security agencies with thousands of ex-Nazi officials is bound to create problems for a democratic society. Serious problems have already arisen. Dr. Werner Hofmeister, Minister of Justice in Lower Saxony, believes that “a Nazi underground is working in Germany with the aim of obstructing law enforcement.” It is obvious that the law-enforcement agencies are remiss in their duties when an estimated 100,000 persons can live undetected for many years under false identities in a country which has an otherwise efficient police system.

It has been suspected for a long time that a secret bond exists between the former top Nazis and certain legal experts who today control the German police and the judiciary. People who have had the opportunity to study the Bonn bureaucracy at close range have noticed a dismaying intimacy between the old Nazi hierarchy and their former legal aides and subordinates.

The deep involvement of a whole governing body in a barbaric crime is the strongest agent for cementing group loyalty. Government and party officials, as well as the SS men, were all accomplices in the Nazi mass murder. The sadistic guards in the torture camps and the “technicians” in the death factories worked only at the end of the assembly line which originated with the legal experts who wrote the text and the commentary for the Nuremberg racial laws. Without the help of these officials Hitler could not have managed the war, administered occupied Europe, and carried out the “Final Solution.”

Participation in such past crimes often has far-reaching consequences today. A well-prepared dossier that threatens to reveal the Nazi record of a high official, a prosecutor, an industrialist, or editor, often serves as a weapon to bring an official or public figure into line. The neo-Nazi press has frequently used blackmail tactics against political leaders by threatening to expose their former collaboration with the Nazis.*

* The best-known case concerns President Theodor Heuss, who was “reminded” that he had once written articles for the Goebbels newspaper Das Reich (see Nation Europa, Nos. 6 and 10, 1958). A similar “reminder” was given to Bundestag President Eugen Gerstenmaier in Nation Europa, No. 7 (1958).
It has been said that a "bureaucracy of murder" was functioning in Hitler's days. It would be a fatal illusion to believe that this awful secret fraternity is no longer in existence. The Naumann case demonstrated the close interdependence of the old Nazi faithfuls. Justice was obstructed with the full knowledge and cooperation of top officials in the government and the judiciary.

In several other cases it has come to light that prosecutors and high officeholders "neglected" their duties and thereby helped make possible the escape of convicted Nazis. Collusion has been proved in the escape of the Bonn diplomat Dr. Franz Rademacher, who was found guilty of having ordered the gassing of thousands of Jews in Yugoslavia. The same collaboration was true in the escape of Dr. Hans Eisele, a concentration camp physician guilty of murdering thousands of prisoners.

Dr. Hans Eisele had been sentenced to death by an American court for mass killing and medical experiments on Allied prisoners in Buchenwald. According to press reports, Dr. Eisele's sentence was later commuted and he became a privileged prisoner. Some time in 1952 he was released for good conduct on the basis of an agreement reached with the Bonn government. As a "late homecomer" (the euphemistic German term for war criminal), he got an immediate sum of 6,000 marks. Next came a loan of 25,000 marks to enable him to open a medical practice. With it went a number of identification papers and certificates informing all authorities that Dr. Eisele had an unimpeachable record. Thus outsiders did not know that he was a former "red-jacket" (as the inmates of the death cells were called) from Landsberg. He was admitted for practice in the State Insurance Office.

In 1954 a former Buchenwald inmate discovered that Dr. Eisele was living comfortably in a suburb outside Munich. It was then that the first official complaint reached the Munich prosecutor, Dr. von Decker. A lengthy correspondence followed. The prosecutor asked for more evidence. He was given names of witnesses and other detailed information. However, no action followed until almost four years later, in May 1958, when new complaints about Dr. Eisele reached the prosecutor and the police. By that time the name of Dr. Eisele had appeared in the headlines. The doctor had talked a widow patient of his into an agreement under which his wife would inherit a large, fashionable villa in exchange for medical treatment for the widow during the remainder of her lifetime. A will was drawn up, and soon afterward the widow died. Relatives of the widow contested the will and the newspapers reported that there was suspicion about the manner of her death.

During the trial of the SS guard Martin Sommer, witnesses named Dr. Eisele as the real mass killer of Buchenwald. Thereupon things became uncomfortable for the doctor. A senator in Munich approached the Chief of Police, Anton Heigl, and asked the immediate arrest of Dr. Eisele. By this time all the police knew about the Buchenwald doctor. But there was no action, either by the police or by the prosecutor.19

When the pressure mounted and the case could no longer be ignored, Dr. Eisele was warned in time to disappear. With the usual help of the Nazi underground, Dr. Eisele fled to Egypt, but he had enough time to sell some of his belongings. After a thorough investigation the Justice Minister dismissed the prosecutor, Dr. von Decker, for having neglected his duties. It turned out that the prosecutor was an "old fighter"
who had joined the Nazi party back in 1931. The Association of Judges and Prosecutors protested. They demanded and got Dr. Decker's immediate reinstatement.

If there was ever the slightest doubt that a kind of Nazi Mafiam, a "bureaucracy of murder," is operating on the highest administrative level, such doubts were eliminated in late 1959, with the exposure of the official protection given to the long-wanted mass murderer Dr. Werner Heyde.

In 1949, Dr. Heyde, under an assumed name, resumed his medical career in the northern town of Flensburg in Schleswig-Holstein, where he soon acquired considerable social standing.

Numerous reports and articles in the German press have told in detail how this Nazi fugitive lived unmolested for twelve years under his alias, "Dr. Fritz Sawade," without being asked for his diploma or credentials. Elevated to top medical positions by the authorities, "Dr. Sawade" was protected from discovery by key officials in the government departments and the judiciary.

In order to understand the significance and implications of this case it is necessary to take a brief look at the historical setting in which this member of the medical profession committed his crimes. Dr. Werner Heyde was thirty-one years old when Hitler came to power in 1933. As a young psychiatrist, he was as deeply devoted to his studies in neurology as he was obsessed with the nationalistic aims of his Fuhrer. The dapper SS officer Dr. Heyde soon became an intimate confidant of Hitler's chief medical advisers. His contacts with the Nazi hierarchy helped to pave the way for a quick professional career. The young neurologist and Brigadier General of the SS was soon rewarded with a professorship at the University of Wuerzburg. In 1939 he was appointed director of the Department of Neurology at the university clinic. It was the year in which Hitler decided to make an all-out effort to conquer Lebensraum for the master race.

Along with the military build-up, secret preparations had been made long in advance to mobilize reliable members of the medical profession in order to carry out a plan of mass murder. In a secret letter of September 1, 1939, Hitler gave authority to his trusted physicians "to the end that patients considered incurable . . . may be granted a merciful death." Under the euphemistic term "euthanasia," elaborate plans were made to get rid of all incurables, all the feeble-minded, crippled children, and invalids, in order to eliminate all "useless eaters" during wartime and to have "full utilization of hospitals and nursing institutions."29 But this was not all. Included in the program was a scheme for the liquidation of tens of thousands of political prisoners and Jews from the concentration camps.

The enormous mass murder project was carried out behind the facade of three "welfare" organizations.* The so-called "mercy death" in many cases became synonymous with indescribable torture and agony. The indictment in the Nuremberg "Doctors' Trial" stated that the "victims of these crimes numbered in the hundreds of thousands."

According to testimony in the "Doctors' Trial," Professor Heyde not only emptied the hospitals and asylums but he also went to Dachau and other concentration camps, where, on the basis of Gestapo files, he selected "enemies of the state" and Jews by the thousands and marked them for liquidation in the gas chambers.

By the end of 1940 the mass killing had reached such pro-

---

* In 1939 the Reich Association for Hospital and Nursing Establishments was founded. Its purpose was to register and "process" all patients marked for liquidation. A second organization, the Charitable Foundation for Institutional Care, was entrusted with the financial arrangements and the installation of a dozen gassing and extermination centers. The appointed head of both charitable fronts was Dr. Werner Heyde. A third group, the Nonprofit Patient-Transport Corporation, run by the SS, as were the other two, had the task of shipping thousands of patients from the hospitals and asylums to the extermination mills (Mitscherlich, Doctors of Infamy).
portions that the extermination practice became common knowledge to large sections of the German population.* On August 3, 1941, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Muenster, Count von Galen, made his famous protest from the pulpit. Thousands of copies were made and circulated secretly among the opponents of the Nazi regime. Unable to keep the mass extermination a secret, Hitler decided in 1941 to transfer the gassing installations to the conquered territories in the East. Here the extermination process, according to Hoess, the commander of Auschwitz, was “improved” so that millions of victims could be accommodated.

The transfer of Hitler’s main charnel houses to the East left Dr. Heyde and his medical colleagues in no way unemployed. They continued “euthanasia” on a smaller scale. “Only” a few thousand each month were killed by deadly injections, but many had to submit to medical experiments. It was revealed in the “Doctors’ Trial” that victims were kept for hours in icy cold water, others got injections of deadly bacilli, and some were subjected to slow starving under painstaking observation.

When the Allies occupied Germany in 1945, they found everything: the complete files of “euthanasia,” the reports and pictures of the “tests,” the laboratories, the torture chambers, and the mounds of corpses—but they didn’t find Dr. Werner Heyde. It was two years before the honorable professor was arrested in Wuerzburg. Soon, however, he escaped from Allied custody under mysterious circumstances, on a transport. Heyde then went underground and found refuge with wealthy friends as a gardener. In 1949 he felt safe enough to reappear as “Dr. Sawade.” Although the professor’s picture appeared regularly on the “wanted” list, the fugitive with an impressive criminal record felt absolutely safe in Flensburg. His real name and his past deeds were known to many of his colleagues, to high police and court officials, and to the upper strata of the town.21

Dr. Heyde’s new professional career in the Bonn Republic was phenomenal. From the start “Dr. Sawade” had the help of influential circles in Flensburg and prominent officials in Schleswig-Holstein.22 In 1949 the mayor of Flensburg appointed “Dr. Sawade” a physician for the municipal athletic school. Two years later “Dr. Sawade” began a medical practice as a psychiatrist. Soon he became official Gutachter—an expert who prepared medical reports for the State Insurance Office. Later he was appointed Obergutachter—a senior expert officially employed in court cases involving medical testimony. It has been reported that “Dr. Sawade’s” income as a Gutachter for the State Insurance Office alone was more than 300,000 marks, earned over a period of six years. “Dr. Sawade” became a man of wealth and reputation. He owned a well-kept villa in an exclusive section of Flensburg, and his cream-colored, flashy sports car was known all over town. Thus the honorable doctor was respected and liked as the “charming widower” who played the lion among Flensburg’s high society. Had not his wife declared in 1951 that Dr. Heyde was dead? Had she not requested a pension as the widow of a man on the “wanted” list? (It has been estimated that Dr. Heyde was responsible for the deaths of 60,000 in the asylums and 140,000 political prisoners from the concentration camps.)23 The “widow” received a pension of 64,500 marks from 1952 to 1959. Yet, at the same time, Frau

* Thousands of families who heard of the sudden deaths of relatives due to “heart failure” became uneasy and tried to penetrate the mystery. Heinrich Himmler stated in December 1940: “I hear that there is great unrest in the Wurtemberg Mountains on account of the Grafeneck Institution. The people know the gray SS bus and think they know what happens in the crematory with its ever-smoking chimney. What does happen there is a secret, and yet it is a secret no longer.” Dr. Franz Schlegelberger of the Reich Ministry of Justice wrote in March 1941 that rumors were spreading throughout Germany in regard to “the elimination of a few hundred thousand mental patients.”
Erika Heyde and her two sons, living in southern Germany, kept up a lively correspondence with a “Dr. Sawade” up in the north.

When the story appeared in early November 1959, leading court officials and police officers came under suspicion of having stalled the arrest proceedings in order to give Dr. Heyde sufficient time to escape. Every day the papers reported additional names of high officials who had known the Heyde-Sawade secret for a long time. There were strong efforts to hush up the affair. Even the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, a loyal Adenauer paper, stated in a front-page editorial (December 15, 1959) that the Heyde case had grown into a major political scandal. The editorial said: “Something must be wrong if a Dr. Sawade could carry on his profession in official splendor for many years. Not all the facts have been made public yet, and we don’t know who is responsible for the mess, but those frantic efforts to avoid a ‘scandal’ will in turn become the true scandal.”

The Prosecutor General of the State, Dr. Adolf Voss, and several cabinet members, were accused of having known the Heyde mystery. Even the Minister-President, Kai-Uwe von Hassel, came under suspicion, but he denied any knowledge of the case. After the Social Democrats demanded an investigation in the Landtag, the president of the Provincial Court, Dr. Ernst Buresch, was suspended for complicity in the case. It was established that in 1954 Dr. Buresch had received a formal complaint charging that his official Obergutachter, “Dr. Sawade,” and the mass killer, Dr. Heyde, were one and the same. This complaint came from a leading member of the medical faculty at the University of Munich, Professor Otto Creutzfeldt. Instead of making an arrest, the “bureaucracy of murder” attempted to settle the case quietly. A “respected jurist” (not identified by name or position) was sent to Munich, where he obtained a “gentlemen’s agreement” under which Professor Creutzfeldt withdrew his complaint.

A number of other officials were suspended in 1959, among them two judges from the Schleswig-Holstein Provincial Court and two top medical officials from the State Insurance Office. These honorable judges and administrators had made themselves a direct part of the farce of submitting the pension claims of victims of Hitler's concentration camps and asylums for the medical opinion of an Obergutachter who in reality was the chief perpetrator in the destruction of 200,000 human lives.

The Minister of Justice, Dr. Bernard Leverenz, admitted in the Landtag on December 1, 1959, that “many officials in the State of Schleswig-Holstein had known for years that Dr. Sawade was not the real name of the Obergutachter.” When the minister announced that six prosecutors had been appointed to investigate the maze of complicity, a Social Democratic deputy sarcastically questioned whether these men didn’t belong to the implicated group, and whether there was anyone left to investigate the investigators.

The whole affair gained an extra touch of irony through the fact that “Dr. Sawade” had lectured before medical audiences on the theme of “euthanasia.” He spoke in detail of the crimes committed by Dr. Heyde, of the mass gassings, and the various “experiments.” There were some among his listeners who were privy to the Heyde-Sawade secret; one was a physician who in earlier years had studied under Professor Heyde at the University of Wuerzburg.

The Heyde affair may be taken as a classic illustration of what is happening in present-day Germany. The Bonn correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, Gaston Coblenz, stated that the favoritism and protection extended by state officials and law-enforcement agencies to ex-Nazi criminals has “assumed the proportions of a national scan-
In addition to the Heyde affair, Mr. Coblentz refers to Dr. Herta Oberheuser and Professor Werner Catel, whose cases have been widely discussed in the German press. Dr. Oberheuser was sentenced by an American court to twenty years for medical experiments on Polish girls. Her sentence was soon commuted, she was readmitted to practice, and she received extensive help from the state and medical authorities in Schleswig-Holstein. Professor Catel served the Nazi regime as a "race-purifier," like his colleague Dr. Heyde. Although he had given the "euthanasia" death to dozens of young children, he was acquitted by a Hamburg court, which reasoned that the Herr Professor "believed in the legality of his action." Among the three judges who handed down the verdict were the Provincial Court director, Dr. Enno Budde, and Judge Halbauer, a member of Hitler's legal terror squad in Czechoslovakia. The Bonn bureau chief of the Rheinischer Merkur, Paul W. Wenger, interpreted the actions of the court in such cases as "a denial of guilt in every realm of public life; it amounts to a general exoneration of the Third Reich, from the euthanasia killing and the racial laws down to the aggressive war policy of Der Fuehrer." 28

As in the case of Drs. Heyde and Oberheuser, the acquitted Professor Catel enjoyed the benevolent backing of the highest state authorities. In 1960 the Minister for Culture and Education, Dr. Osterloh, appointed Professor Catel to the office of Director of the Children's Clinic at the Kiel University. Only when a few West German papers put a spotlight on this case was Professor Catel forced to resign.

Many German doctors were involved with "euthanasia," unethical experiments, and mass gassings. Only a few were sentenced by Allied and German courts, but usually their sentences were soon commuted and they were readmitted to practice. The release of the ill-famed Nazi physician Dr. Hans-Bodo Gorgasz caused much criticism. This doctor had personally supervised the gassing of at least 10,000 human beings, among them many women and children. It was established at the trial that this model of the medical profession had a habit of observing the slow agony of his victims through a little window of the gas chamber. When Dr. Gorgasz' sentence was commuted, the Sueddeutsche Zeitung of February 8, 1958, quoted the Justice Minister of Hesse as defending his release with the following statement: "There are hundreds of doctors who did worse during the Nazi regime, but they were never brought to court."

The Nazi criminals are free because prosecutors, judges, and politicians have gone to great lengths to cover up crimes like those committed by Dr. Heyde and Professor Catel. Their actions were and still are mainly determined by a deep-rooted sense of camaraderie which they call Korpsgeist—one for all and all for one.

Their common Nazi past has engendered a secret tie of brotherhood between the Globkes, Buddes, Rademachers, Kanters, Oberlaenders, and Heydes, who are united by a single ideology, mutual dependence, entanglement in a gigantic crime, the feeling of fellowship known to outlaws who have escaped the gallows, and the iron will to stay in power.
15  From the Rogues' Gallery

The general laxity of the courts in handling Nazi war crime cases has done much to undermine the confidence of world public opinion in a truly reformed Germany. Because of the previous close involvement of Nazi criminals and German law officials, it is quite logical, and almost natural, that prosecutors frequently hesitate to initiate indictments. This has been true in cases where witnesses and ample evidence have been available for years.

The story of the Waffen SS General and high police official, Heinz Reinefarth, has been published in leading German newspapers. General Reinefarth played a prominent role in the murderous suppression of the Warsaw uprising in August 1944. The insurgents had formed a poorly armed freedom corps of 40,000, who tried to drive the Germans out of the Polish capital. General Reinefarth’s SS moved in with tanks and defeated the resistance.

The documented record shows that Reinefarth and his troops not only fought against the combatants, but they took their revenge on the civilian population. More than 200,000 people were killed within one month. All wounded Poles, including doctors, nuns, and nurses were slain. Thousands of women and children were driven into churches, locked up, and burned alive. The most heinous acts were committed by the SS Dirlewanger Brigade, an outfit composed of notorious criminals who had been released from prison so that they could “regain their honor” on the war front. Some weeks later, Reinefarth reported with great pride in the Nazi paper Ostdeutscher Beobachter (October 5, 1944) that his SS force had liquidated “more than a quarter of a million Poles during the Warsaw fighting.” For his heroic deeds, Reinefarth was decorated by Hitler.

When the occupation authorities ordered democratic elections after the war, the people of the fashionable North Sea resort of Westerland voted the former SS General and war criminal into office as burgher master. In 1958, Reinefarth ran on the Refugee party ticket as a candidate for the Schleswig-Holstein State Parliament. When the press cited Reinefarth’s record as a major war criminal, the Senior Prosecutor of Flensburg, Erich Biermann (who had Herr Dr. Heyde-Sawade under his protective wing at that time), closed the case and refused to issue an indictment. A few days later Reinefarth was elected as deputy to the Landtag and accepted as an honorable colleague.

The next case concerns the Refugee Minister, Dr. Theodor Oberlaender, who joined the Adenauer cabinet in 1953. As briefly mentioned in a previous chapter, Minister Oberlaender is accused of having been involved in the so-called “Lemberg massacre,” in which several thousand Poles and more than 5,000 Jews were slaughtered. Dr. Oberlaender does not deny a) that he was the commanding officer of a special SS task force, the Nightingale Battalion, made up of nationalist Ukrainians; and b) that this battalion was the first German unit to move into the Polish city of Lemberg on June 29, 1941, where it remained for six or seven days. Dr. Oberlaender does deny that his troops committed any
atrocities in Lemberg. He has said that during his stay in that city “not a shot was fired.” This is not even accepted by his CDU party colleagues; they believe only that Oberlaender himself took no part in the massacre. Although formal complaints were launched against the Refugee Minister, and although witnesses in West Germany, in Israel, and in Poland were willing to testify, the German authorities delayed as long as possible before considering official court action. 2 In the Bundestag debate of December 10, 1959, a government spokesman declared: “Dr. Oberlaender has the full confidence of the Adenauer cabinet.”

There was no denying that Dr. Oberlaender had written articles advocating the extermination of Jews and Poles in the East, that he was closely affiliated with the racial warfare section of Hitler’s SS, and that he was the appointed leader of the fanatical Nazi unit, German Alliance in the East.

A wide-spread feeling prevailed in Dr. Adenauer’s own party that Hitler’s former expert on the East had become a political liability. The pro-Adenauer paper Rheinischer Merkur stated that Dr. Oberlaender “as a racial expert has an intellectual co-responsibility for the anti-Polish and anti-Jewish outbursts in Lemberg.” 3 The Christian Democratic paper Der Tag (February 9, 1960) called for Oberlaender’s resignation and described him as “a drag on the German reputation.”

The Social Democratic opposition and the independent press demanded Dr. Oberlaender’s ouster. Der Spiegel stated editorially: “This man should never have been appointed a minister.” Pointing to Oberlaender’s long record as a Nazi propagandist and Lebensraum expert, the editorial asked sarcastically: “Is a man sufficiently qualified to become a cabinet member in Germany merely by having it established that he doesn’t have a record as a murderer of innocent civilians?” 4

Nevertheless, in the summer of 1959, Dr. Oberlaender was given the honor of representing the Chancellor at the moral rearmament conference in Caux. 5 It was only the combined pressure of Social Democrats and a large faction of Christian Democratic deputies that finally forced Dr. Oberlaender to resign in May 1960. 6

Two other unprosecuted cases among many should be briefly mentioned to show the scope of the crimes committed. The first concerns the SS General Erich von dem Bach-Zelewski, who was in charge of a special task force for the liquidation of Jews in the East. As one of Hitler’s top police officers, he is held responsible for the killing of hundreds of Jews long before the outbreak of the war. According to a DPA report in the New York Staats Zeitung of April 14, 1952, it was Bach-Zelewski who organized a pogrom against the Jews all over Silesia on the “Crystal Night” of 1938. He reported to Hitler that his storm troopers had set fire to eighty synagogues and that he had made Silesia judenrein. During 1941, Bach-Zelewski’s SS brigade shot more than 100,000 Jews and Poles in the East.

Although the Bonn authorities had full knowledge of Bach-Zelewski’s record, they left the SS General unmolested until December 1958. At that time he was arrested for being implicated in a “private” murder case involving another SS officer. He has since been sentenced to four and a half years in prison.

Another example concerns the SS officer Hermann Krumey who played a decisive role in the murder of 460,000 Hungarian Jews. As an aide to Adolf Eichmann, Krumey, in the spring and summer of 1944, rounded up all Jews in Hungary and shipped them to Auschwitz. According to Die Welt of

* In September 1960 it was reported that a prosecutor in Bonn refused to open the case against Dr. Oberlaender “for lack of evidence that he had participated or was responsible for the mass killing” (Deutsche Zeitung, September 28, 1960).
August 16, 1958, Krumey today owns a drugstore in Korbach, Hesse, where he has been active in politics for the Nazi-infested Refugee party. The former SS officer was temporarily arrested in 1957, but was soon released. He was arrested again in connection with the Eichmann case in May 1960.

Many new facts about unsolved war crimes have come to light during the last two years. The extent of unpunished Nazi crime was revealed in three major court cases which were not tried until 1958. One was a trial against ten SS and police officials, held before a court in Ulm, Württemberg. After months of testimony the court found that the accused had slaughtered 5,502 Jews in the Tilsit district. This was part of a larger action in which 132,000 Jews were liquidated in order to provide a Lithuanian frontier region for German settlement. Evidence of indescribable atrocities was produced. Thanks to bureaucratic thoroughness, the court was able to use the meticulously kept lists in which the police had recorded their daily number of victims. The ten Nazis were given sentences from three to fifteen years.

The second court case revealed the story of the SS sergeant Martin Sommer, the “butcher of Buchenwald.” As master of the punishment cell block, Sommer whipped hundreds of prisoners to death, killed many with hypodermic injections of air, hung others from trees by their wrists, and amused himself by transforming priests into “snowmen” by dousing them with buckets of water and letting them freeze to death. Sommer was sentenced to life imprisonment, the maximum penalty under German law, and one rarely imposed.

Late in 1958, two SS guards were put on trial for tortures and mass killings at the Sachsenhausen concentration camp.

\* In his summation the defense lawyer, Herr Aschenauer, declared: “The defendants only carried out those orders which the bureaucrats had issued at their desks” (Die Welt, August 12, 1958).
chapter of the "undigested past." What is suggested is a general amnesty for all crimes committed under the Nazi regime. Such an act would bring the "bureaucracy of murder" out of the danger zone.

16 The Heroes Come Home...

During the early fifties, German towns and villages competed in spectacular receptions for their homecoming "heroes"—the convicted Nazi war criminals who, under mounting German pressure, had been released from Allied custody. The Nazi Generals and SS officers were greeted with flowers, brass bands, ringing church bells, and banners strung across the streets. Huge crowds jubilantly joined in singing "Deutschland, Deutschland, ueber Alles."

Many of the returning war criminals were given expensive gifts, and some were even rewarded with new cars—a Volkswagen, Porsche, or Mercedes-Benz. The noisy welcomes of these "late homecomers" were much more than mere expressions of human sympathy. These manifestations amounted to an open show of solidarity between the German people and those who once represented the elite of the Nazi regime. Dr. Adenauer expressed the sentiment of the over-

* In 1952 the Bundestag voted unanimously to introduce a "Treue-Woche"—Loyalty Week—in order to assure the last 800 war criminals, those most deeply implicated, that they were "closely bound to and deeply revered by their compatriots." The Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung of October 16, 1952, hailed this step as a "united act of the entire German nation."
whelming majority of his countrymen when he made his demonstrative visit to the prison in Werl, where he shook hands with Nazi war criminals who had once been condemned to death for their crimes. And when Field Marshal Albert Kesselring, who destroyed Warsaw, Rotterdam, and Coventry, was released from jail, he was honored by the Chancellor with a two-hour audience. 1

Upon his release from the Spandau prison, Baron Konstantin von Neurath was warmly congratulated in long telegrams from President Heuss and Chancellor Adenauer for the final ending of his “martyrdom.” The German press, with few exceptions, published glowing articles about him, and the people from his home district gave von Neurath a triumphant welcome. 2 A cheering crowd of thousands lined the streets for miles. The German people and their leaders were welcoming a man who had worked closely with Hitler in the preparation of aggressive war and who, as “protector” of Bohemia and Moravia, was the architect of an elaborate plan to enslave or kill half of the Czechs and Germanize the other half. The Baron had “reached the lowest rung on the ladder which led him from international diplomacy to international brigandage.” 3

The release of Baron von Neurath from the international prison in Spandau had long been suggested by Adenauer and was announced by the Soviets in November 1954. The Soviet step came as a complete surprise to the Western powers; it was the result of lengthy, secret negotiations that had been carried on between Bonn and Moscow since 1952. These secret talks were climaxed in 1955 by Dr. Adenauer’s visit to Moscow. * The Chancellor’s admitted aim was to

---

* The Christian Science Monitor reported on April 17, 1954, that “secret talks between Bonn and Moscow have been going on for about three years,” and that “in August 1952 a group of Bonn diplomats and industrialists had a secret meeting with high Moscow officials in a hotel in Copenhagen.”

work for the release of the Nazi war criminals, whom the Soviets had sentenced to long prison terms for their crimes against millions of Slavs. In 1955 the Soviets no longer held any regular prisoners of war, but had in their custody 9,626 convicted German nationals from Field Marshals down to SS concentration camp guards.

There have been conflicting reports about Adenauer’s negotiations in Moscow. The officially inspired German explanation was that the Chancellor tried his utmost to persuade the Kremlin leaders to release all German prisoners still in their hands. A pact was made under which the Soviets agreed to set free the convicted war criminals, while Bonn promised to open diplomatic relations with Moscow. By way of an amnesty the Russians unconditionally released the great majority of the prisoners, except for 749 men whose crimes had been of such a nature that the Russians refused to take the responsibility for letting them go free. According to some reports the Soviets had asked Adenauer to keep these 749 war criminals in detention until the German authorities had made a careful check of the complete court records, which Moscow would hand over to the Germans.

When the returning war criminals were received at the German border, the Bonn authorities outdid themselves. Newspaper articles spoke of the “greatest event in German postwar history.” 4 Thousands of cars converged on the reception camp in Friedland, where the celebration was held, and as usual the crowds sang “Deutschland ueber Alles.” Welcome speeches were given by members of the Adenauer cabinet and other government officials. One transport of several hundred war criminals was addressed by Refugee Minister Oberlaender. In this particular gathering of SS men were the “euthanasia” killer Professor Clauberg of Auschwitz and the prison camp sadists Gustav Sorge and “Pistol” Schubert. They were greeted by Dr. Oberlaender with the follow-
ing welcome: “Every one of you had to suffer for all of us. But now I invite you to serve as the yeast in our comrade-ship.”

The transports from Russia were chiefly made up of Hitler’s Waffen SS men, members of the Gestapo, the Sicherheitsdienst, and the Feldgendarmerie—a military police unit entrusted with mass extermination. The remainder were Nazi party officials and concentration camp guards. Most of them had been sentenced to twenty years of hard labor. When newspapermen asked for names and the wartime units, not many of the prisoners volunteered information. One of the returnees, shrugging his shoulders, said: “I don’t think I care to discuss that. We all did a lot of killing. That’s war.”

As stated earlier, not one of the war criminals remained in detention. Each of the returnees received 6,000 marks and all became eligible for interest-free loans and pensions. The press reported that flowers and gifts arrived in Friedland by the carload. In praising the heroes who had “suffered for Germany,” the newspapers revealed the identities of some of the returning prisoners. In that way the survivors of the concentration camps noted the names of such men as Clauberg, Sorge, and Schubert. Yet it was many months before the German authorities rearrested some of these criminals and brought them to court.

During the Sorge-Schubert trial it was revealed that a smooth Nazi underground had operated in the prisoner reception camp at Friedland. All returning war criminals had been given strict instructions not to admit to any former crimes and, in case of an investigation, to take counsel from a list of selected lawyers who would defend them free of charge.*

Effective schemes had been developed by the Nazis and militarists to obstruct law and justice. After they had reached success, after thousands of Nazi criminals had fled to Spain and Egypt, after other thousands had been freed from Allied prisons, there appeared accounts in some Rightist newspapers, congratulating a group of Nazi ringleaders on accomplishing an almost impossible task. The Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung (June 1958) published a full-page account of a far-reaching secret organization which had been founded in 1948 in violation of Allied rules. The purpose of the organization was to free the war criminals in defiance of law and justice. The author of this remarkable report, Major General Hans Korte, describes how a kind of General Staff, or “steering committee,” was set up in Munich to direct all the anti-war-guilt propaganda in occupied Germany and throughout the entire world. A group of Nazi jurists who had served in Nuremberg as counsels for major war criminals formed the nucleus of the directing body. Prominent among them were Dr. Rudolf Aschenauer of Munich and Ernst Achenbach (of the Naumann circle) of Essen, the latter having excellent financial connections on Rhine and Ruhr.

In order to conceal certain activities from the occupying powers, a number of fronts or subagencies were created to serve as special task forces. To furnish the press with propaganda on the war-guilt question, an “independent” monthly newsletter, Die Andere Seite (The Other Side), was issued, in which material about the “so-called war criminals” was

* An American correspondent reported from Bonn that the Soviets had asked for further imprisonment of those who had committed atrocities. This the Germans would not agree to. “Public opinion in this country would be violently opposed to any measures against the returned men. It would be almost out of the question politically to begin court proceedings against any sizable number of them” (New York Herald Tribune, January 15, 1956).

* Frankfurter Rundschau, January 12, 1959. Later it was discovered that the official in charge of records and identifications in the Friedland camp was a former SS officer, Garwinski, who, up to 1960, had lived under the false identity of “von Rosen.” According to Die Welt (January 2, 1960), his case is under investigation.
cleverly introduced among other news items. This distorted and slanted news was reprinted not only in the provincial press but in such leading papers as the Frankfurter Allgemeine, the Stuttgarter Nachrichten, and Die Welt. In addition, a circular letter was mailed periodically to organizations and influential personalities in Germany and abroad in order to gain their support for the release of all war criminals.

To camouflage these activities well-known German church representatives were brought into the organization, so that both major denominations joined the common defense for the convicted Nazi war criminals. A Committee for Christian Aid to War Prisoners was formed in 1948; among its sponsors there were prominent Roman Catholics—Cardinal Josef Frings of Cologne and Bishop Johann Neuhaeussler of Munich—and leading Protestants—Bishop Theophil Wurm of Stuttgart and Bishop Meiser of Munich. These church leaders had already issued several strong protests against the Allied war crime trials. Now Cardinal Frings and others demanded a halt to the hanging of convicted Nazis. In May 1946, Washington had ordered a stop to all executions in Landsberg. But there were still 230 Nazis sentenced to death for having committed mass murder. In 1948, Cardinal Frings again asked President Truman for clemency for the last two dozen convicted Nazis, whose executions were pending.6

Under the sponsorship and prestige of Cardinal Frings and Bishop Wurm, a wide network of organizations coordinated their efforts to save the convicted criminals from the gallows. The church leaders were supported by two powerful religious organizations—the Roman Catholic Caritas and the Protestant Evangelisches Hilfswerk. The latter had given jobs and shelter to dozens of Nazi officials, especially former Ribbentrop diplomats. This group issued a weekly newspaper, Christ und Welt, in which the campaign for the war criminals had top priority.

Cardinal Frings and Bishop Wurm headed another organization under the slightly confusing name, Committee for Justice and Trade, which served as a rallying point for the former Nazi elite. According to General Korte’s account, this group consisted of ex-officers, high government officials, jurists, educators, industrialists, and church leaders. Its purpose was to raise money to assist all war criminals financially and legally and to create a climate of public opinion conducive to the release of all convicted Nazis. The organization had a mysterious bank account (“Konto Gustav”), to which more than sixty unnamed industrial and financial tycoons regularly contributed large sums. According to the report in the Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung, this group was closely affiliated with a propaganda center in Switzerland, the Centro Europa, which carried on a world-wide campaign to bring quick freedom to Hitler’s professional mass murderers. Two other organizations were working toward the same goal, but they extended their activities into the exclusive circles of high society and among aristocrats in Germany and abroad. One was the Stille Hilfe (Silent Help), headed by Princess Helene von Isenburg, and the other was called Helfende Haende (Helping Hands), and was directed by Princess Stepahny zu Schaumberg-Lippe.

The common characteristic of all these groups was their dual activity; first, they solicited financial aid for Nazi prisoners, and second, they stirred propaganda against the “war-guilt lie,” climaxing it with a demand for speedy release of all war criminals. Working in cooperation with the Christian Aid center in Munich were such notorious Nazi organizations as the SS HIAG, the Society of Late Homecomers, the Stahlhelm, the Federation of German Soldiers, and the various expellee groups. Among the organizations abroad we
find the Kameraden Hilfe in Spain, headed by the SS Colonel Otto Skorzeny, a similar group working in Latin America under the leadership of the Luftwaffe ace Colonel Hans Ulrich Rudel,* and various German “relief” and propaganda organizations in the United States under the political guidance of the Steuben Society.

In his article General Korte gave due credit to the German press which, “despite Allied censorship, courageously published demands for a clean sweep of the whole war criminal problem and, by doing so, made its readers aware that German soldiers were still in Allied custody, thus stirring the conscience of the nation.” Among the papers praised for their courage in protesting the occupation law were the Frankfurter Allgemeine and such neo-Nazi periodicals as Der Heimkehrer, the Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung, the Notweg, and Der Stahlhelm. Also of great propaganda value were “a number of foreign newspapers and periodicals” which General Korte did not identify.

From the Christian Aid headquarters in Munich a stream of often repeated propaganda was channeled through all media of communication. The war crime trials were branded as a “victor’s justice of revenge”; all prisoners were declared “innocent”; and the worst Nazi mass murderers were glorified as “martyrs.”†

Long before Dr. Adenauer had been made Chancellor,

* Skorzeny and Rudel, assisted by the SS Colonel Eugen Dollmann, ran a smooth underground for the escape of war criminals to Spain, Egypt, and Argentina. According to the New York Times of March 21, 1953, the Rudel group had even hatched a plan to raid the prison at Werl and free all war criminals in British custody. Rudel was discouraged by the Bundestag member Dr. Erich Mende, who knew that the Western powers had promised gradual release of all prisoners. Rudel’s act would only have spoiled Germany’s chances for regaining her sovereignty.

† An editorial in the Frankfurter Allgemeine of October 26, 1954, used the German term Rachejustiz—justice of vengeance—and the weekly Christ und Welt of May 12, 1955, spoke of the Malmédy killers as “unfortunates who were thrown into prison although they were all innocent.”

the anti-war-guilt campaign and free-the-war-criminals propaganda had reached a high pitch. It was psychological warfare in grand style and the impact on the Pentagon was quite noticeable. The Generals in Washington knew that they could not have the desired German army of 500,000 men without letting all war criminals free. It was bargaining in which the Germans clearly had the Pentagon brass at a disadvantage. During 1948 and 1949 the sentences of hundreds of war criminals were commuted by General Clay. When Ilse Koch, known as the “bitch of Buchenwald,” was released after serving only three years of a life sentence, protests came in from all over the world.

After Dr. Adenauer became Chancellor in 1949, the German demand for freeing the war criminals became an undisguised policy of political blackmail. Many politicians stated the case quite bluntly in the press and in the Bundestag: They would not ratify the treaties (creating a common Western defense) without a “clean sweep on the war crimes question.” Although the politicians were well aware that Washington had tacitly yielded to German demands, they relentlessly increased the pressure. The State Department had to grapple with the delicate problem of how the Western Allies could gradually release a few thousand war criminals without arousing indignant protests in their own countries. Yet the German pressure groups approached the newly appointed High Commissioner, John McCloy, with strong demands. As a result McCloy had to set free those Nazis whom he himself had termed “the worst war criminals still alive in Landsberg.”† More than two hundred of these, originally sentenced to death by U.S. courts, had had their

* According to official figures, in April 1950 there were still 3,600 convicted war criminals in Allied custody in Germany. In addition, there were more than 2,000 Nazi war criminals held in other non-Communist countries. In August 1952 there were only 800 war criminals left in U.S. and British custody in Germany.
sentences commuted to life imprisonment or even shorter terms.

At the end of 1950 there still remained more than two dozen men in the death cells waiting for a decision on their fate. They consisted chiefly of two groups: members of the SS unit which had committed the notorious Malmedy massacre, and commanding officers of the various SS special task forces who had carried out the brutal mass executions of several hundred thousand Jews, Gypsies, and Poles in the occupied East during 1940 and 1941. Some of these men were responsible for the deaths of 60,000 and 100,000 human beings. These “red-jackets” became the focus of a campaign for mercy which mobilized the whole German nation.

In January 1951 the Christian Aid committee in Munich, with its leading churchmen and politicians, and dozens of organizations again flooded High Commissioner McCloy with telegrams and petitions demanding that he immediately commute the sentences of the few “red-jackets” still in the Landsberg prison. At the same time, Mr. McCloy’s “mail became heavy with threats against his life and that of his family.” What he had to face, according to his own words, was “a well-organized conspiracy to intimidate me.” In brief, the Germans had started one of their famous blitzkriegs (this time only psychological) in order to demonstrate their close solidarity with the convicted Nazi war criminals and to rescue all of them from the gallows.

The following facts are taken from Arthur Krock’s illuminating account in the New York Times. On January 9, 1951, the U.S. High Commissioner received a delegation of German parliamentary leaders in his office. The group urgently requested that he “commute the death sentences of those in the Landsberg prison convicted as war criminals.” The delegation was made up of Dr. Hermann Ehlers, president of the Bundestag, Heinrich Hoeffer, Carlos Schmid, Jakob Altmaier, Hans von Merkatz, and Franz Josef Strauss, each representing one of the various political parties. The Bundestag leaders told Mr. McCloy that West Germany had abolished the death sentence and “they wanted no more blood spilling in Germany.” The Social Democratic leader, Carlos Schmid, said: “We want to create a new moral climate in Germany.” And he added: “If the United States would carry out the executions, it would shock the German conscience.” Franz Josef Strauss argued that “the long delay in carrying out the death sentences called for a commutation.” Should the prisoners be executed, “the blow to German morale would be great and the effect on German-American relations would be devastating.”

According to the Times report, Mr. McCloy “expressed surprise and distress that none of the pleaders had mentioned the horror and enormity of the crimes of Nazi authorities which evoked, among others, the trials of those for whom . . . blanket clemency was sought.” And he called attention to the fact that “there are no prisoners in the world whose cases have received the same painstaking review.” The High Commissioner remarked that it was “a bad thing for the German soul to put these things under the carpet.” He pointed out that the “Bishops, lawyers and the man on the street . . . don’t know, and they don’t want to know, what happened to the other people.” He concluded: “If our relations depend on these individual cases, then our friendship hangs on a thin thread indeed.”

Even stronger personal efforts were made by Princess Helene von Isenburg, who had earned the honor of being named the “mother of the red-jackets.” The Princess sent urgent telegrams to President Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, and Mrs. McCloy, with a plea for commutation. A few days later the Princess was invited to dinner by the McCloys. According to a long report in Der Spiegel, the Princess pleaded for two and a half hours that the High Commissioner spare the twenty-eight “red-jackets” who “had suf-
fered horrible torment in fear of death and are almost insane." Just how deeply the Princess impressed the High Commissioner has not been reported, but Mrs. McCloy sent her a check to aid the prisoners and wrote: "I too feel that we have to bridge our mutual problems, and I assure you, it was for Mr. McCloy and myself not only an honor but also a great joy to have had you as our guest." 

Needless to say, the U.S. High Commissioner was walking a tightrope. There was no one with a friendlier attitude toward the beaten enemy; Der Spiegel once described McCloy as having an "almost pathological love for Germany." His attitude was exploited by the Germans to the utmost. The newspapers stated the case very bluntly: either the war criminals would be freed or there would be no German army. Delegation after delegation filed through John McCloy's office—high church dignitaries, women's organizations, professors, politicians, an ad hoc committee, "Rescue the Red-Jackets," the representatives of the ex-soldier organizations, and many others. Through the mail came tens of thousands of pleading letters and telegrams from Germans and sympathizers all over the world. There were a few telegrams of protest from veterans and Jewish organizations in America, which made the decision for Commissioner McCloy no easier. "For days," reports the former U.S. diplomat Charles W. Thayer, Mr. McCloy "locked himself in his home, reading and rereading the testimony. His nerves got tauter and tauter, his temper shorter and shorter." On the evening before the High Commissioner had to make his fateful decision, Dr. Adenauer's military advisers, Generals Adolf Heusinger and Hans Speidel, called Mr. Thayer, a U.S. liaison diplomat, to an urgent conference. They asked him to convey one last plea to Mr. McCloy before it was too late. "If the prisoners at Landsberg were hanged, Germany as an armed ally against the East was an illusion." 

The campaign was largely successful. By the end of January 1951, Commissioner McCloy and U.S. General Thomas Handy had commuted the sentences of twenty-one of the twenty-eight "red-jackets" and had left the fate of the other seven undecided.* The American lawyer for the remaining seven made an appeal for a habeas corpus before the Supreme Court in Washington. In addition, the Germans rushed 610,280 signatures by air mail to the White House in a plea for mercy. When the last appeal was rejected, the seven "red-jackets" were hung on the night of June 6-7, 1951, in the courtyard of the Landsberg prison.

The balance sheet of Germany's Christian Aid crusade is quite impressive. Hundreds of Nazi mass murderers, once condemned to death, had their sentences commuted to life imprisonment, and soon were released from Allied prisons. Toward the end of 1952, a mixed review board of three Germans, one American, one Britisher, and one Frenchman was burdened with the task of gradually and quietly releasing the last "poor devils" who once had lived in the death rows of Landsberg and Werl. Within a few years, all but a few German war criminals in the Western countries had been set free. The Soviet Union followed suit by releasing her 9,626 war criminals late in 1955.

Thus the heroes came home. Ten years after the most horrible crime in recorded history, the sun of mercy was shining down on all. Today, up to 20,000 unreconstructed criminals are free to go about their business in Germany. A few thousands more are scattered through Spain, Egypt, and Argentina. Tens of thousands more still live under false papers, and other untold thousands have not even been touched by an investigation. There has never been a clearer and more convincing identification between a nation and its "heroes."

* The seven "red-jackets" were the SS special task officers Oswald Pohl, Otto Ohlendorf, Erich Naumann, Werner Braune, Paul Blobel, and the Dachau SS guards Georg Schallermaier and Hans-Theodor Schmidt.
On March 14, 1960, a historic encounter took place at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. In the living room of the presidential suite, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer met the Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, for the first time. During a two-hour private talk the two leaders discussed the implications of the recent world-wide epidemic of anti-Semitic outbursts and the future of German-Israeli relations. At the close of the meeting, the two statesmen were photographed shaking hands, and the press officers read their statements into the microphones.

Dr. Adenauer said: “I am deeply moved by my meeting today with Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. . . . The German people draw deep satisfaction from the fact that, through their restitution to victims of Nazism, a contribution was made toward the process of rehabilitation in Israel.”

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion stated: “I was glad to meet Chancellor Adenauer. I belong to a people which cannot forget its past. . . . I said last summer that ‘the Germany of today is not the Germany of yesterday.’ After having met the Chancellor, I am sure that judgment is correct.”

There is little doubt that the actions of both leaders were motivated by political expediency as well as by mutual good will and respect. Their meeting was possible only after they had overcome strong political opposition in their respective countries.

Dr. Adenauer had risked his personal prestige and the stability of his coalition government when he told the Bundestag on September 27, 1951, that the German people must be “conscious of the immeasurable suffering brought upon the Jews in Germany and the occupied territories during the National Socialist period.” The Chancellor stated plainly that “unspeakable crimes were committed in the name of the German people which call for moral and material restitution.”

According to the Chancellor’s biographer, Paul Weymar, the suggestion of paying reparations to Israel was met with “serious disapproval” by members of Dr. Adenauer’s own party and by the politicians making up his government coalition. There were many who had not the slightest recognition of the need for reparations, not the faintest feeling that the past had to be redressed, if only in the form of financial indemnity.* The Finance Minister, Dr. Schaeffer, was opposed to making reparation payments to Israel. The Adenauer press and German commerce and manufacturing circles feared that compensation to Israel would alienate Germany’s friends in the Middle East. “The Arabs had always been pro-German, they had been the only asset German diplomacy had possessed after the collapse, and now this traditional friendship was being jeopardized.” 1

* On March 18, 1951, Israel transmitted a note to the three Western powers and to the Soviet Union, calling attention to the fact that the unending stream of hundreds of thousands of homeless and destitute Jewish refugees from Germany and German-occupied Europe which it had been compelled to receive had placed an unbearable burden on the young Jewish state. The Nazis had confiscated Jewish assets in the amount of eight billion dollars in Germany alone. It was expected that Germany would make amends to alleviate the burden placed upon Israel.
Apart from the moral principle involved, there were important political and psychological considerations which compelled Dr. Adenauer to reach an agreement on the Jewish claims. Despite boycott threats from the Arabs, Dr. Adenauer pressed for a settlement which called for payments in goods and materials to Israel amounting to $715,000,000, extending over a period of twelve years. When the bill reached the Bundestag for final approval on March 18, 1953, the Chancellor found himself deserted by a large faction of his own party and by most members of his coalition. Out of 402 members of Parliament, only 298 voted in favor of the bill; the remaining abstained or voted against it. Without the support of 125 Social Democrats, Dr. Adenauer would have lost the day. Of his own 143 party members, only 83 voted for the bill. More than 50 percent of the Adenauer coalition members refused to support the settlement with Israel. Among those who abstained were cabinet members Dr. Schaeffer and Dr. Seebohm. Some critics declared that the Adenauer coalition had exposed itself in a "shameful act of moral depravity" by disregarding the bare essentials of justice and human decency.  

Thus the Chancellor's statement that the Germans "draw deep satisfaction [from making] restitution to victims of Nazism" has little validity. There is almost nothing more unpopular in Germany than the reparations payments to Israel and the indemnification to the victims of Nazism. Nevertheless Dr. Adenauer has insisted that the Israeli agreement be carried out to the letter, a stand for which he has earned ample praise in Israel. From the beginning the 

* It is often forgotten that the Israeli agreement was closely tied to the London Debt Conference in 1952, at which the U.S. canceled more than two billion dollars of German postwar debts in order to enable the Bonn government to make indemnification to the Jewish state. The U.S. was pushing for a settlement. The Minister of Justice, Dr. Dehler, declared: "The settlement with Israel is a business for which the Americans will compensate us quite handsomely" (Frankfurter Rundschau, February 24, 1953).
the progress of his restitution case. After a while, having
been sent from one bureaucrat to the other, the old man com-
mitted suicide in despair.8

In a recent review about the shortcomings of the indem-
nification procedure, the American Jewish Congress stated
that the slow implementation has caused "bitter complaints
and shattering disappointments among those who have suf-
fured persecution." The claims for indemnification "are lost
in the snarled administrative machinery." The statistical
record demonstrates the gravity of the situation: "Only
36.8 percent of all indemnification claims were settled by
the middle of 1959 . . . out of the total of 2,888,884 claims
submitted, only 1,081,463 had been processed . . . out of the
2.6 billion marks appropriated in 1958/1959 for indem-
nification payments, about 1 billion were not paid out.
These figures translated into human suffering mean this:
Since the average value of an indemnification claim is below
10,000 marks, over 100,000 claimants have had to defer
their hopes even though the necessary funds were available."4

There have been reports of a few cases in which substantial
sums were paid to people who either had close connections
with officials in Bonn or who had been helpful in promoting
favorable propaganda. In the majority of cases, however, the
German authorities have built up barriers of difficulties by
demanding clear proof and detailed documentary evidence
of any loss or damage suffered twenty-five years ago. In count-
less cases indemnification is often refused on the basis of
legal technicalities. A typical case of sabotage was reported
started legal proceedings in 1949, and twice had to go as far
as the highest court of appeals. In October 1959, ten years
after the start of this legal marathon, the highest court ren-
dered a favorable verdict. This time the execution of the
verdict was halted by an interdict on the part of the provin-
cial governor. The victim is now over eighty years of age.
had been imprisoned for several years by the Gestapo. The charge was that she had helped Jews to escape from the country. After considering her request for indemnification, the court ruled that the Gestapo was correct in punishing such "treasonable activities," and her plea was refused.6

The Bonn government has also refused to make any financial compensation to the victims of Nazi persecution in foreign countries. When a group of 57 Polish women who had been used as human guinea pigs for medical experiments in the Ravensbrueck concentration camp requested indemnification from Bonn, they received an "icy and cynical rejection" from the Federal Ministry of Finance. The excuse was that no diplomatic ties existed between Bonn and Warsaw and therefore no payments could be made.7

In 1958 a group of 2,294 Polish ex-prisoners, the survivors of slave labor for the I. G. Farben concern in Auschwitz, brought in a modest suit for 10,000 marks each for past sufferings. Far from suggesting a settlement, the court in Frankfurt rejected the suit on the basis that the "statute of limitations had expired."

In the same year, the Minister of Justice (once the Finance Minister), Dr. Fritz Schaeffer, complained that excessive expenditures for indemnification would endanger the stability of the German currency. Yet there are the secret bank accounts of Nazi leaders which have never been touched by the German authorities (twenty million marks were discovered in two Berlin banks in 1956). Other large accounts were hidden in various West German banks. And instead of using every available penny for the rehabilitation of the victims of persecution, tremendous sums were paid yearly to ex-Nazis.

In 1954 the National Zeitung of Basle, in an article, "The Bonn Rehabilitation Scandal," reported that "about 85 percent of the middle and upper dignitaries of the Nazi party, and SA and SS are today receiving their full pensions. In

approximately half of their cases the pension amounts to 1,000 marks a month."8 The same is true for the Generals of Hitler's Wehrmacht, whether or not they were sentenced as war criminals. At the beginning of 1960 the German press reported that more than 1,000 Generals and Admirals were receiving pensions averaging 2,636 marks each month. There were 668 widows or relatives of Generals who were getting 60 percent of the full pensions.9 Similar high pensions are paid to 12 former Secretaries of State, to 59 directors of ministry departments, and to several dozen widows of such high officials. The former SS General Karl Wolff, who at one point was shipping 5,000 Jews daily to the Treblinka concentration camp, today lives comfortably on a General's pension in Kempfenhausen.10 Dr. Franz Schlegelberger, Hitler's State Secretary in the Ministry of Justice and one of the chief architects of Nazi terror laws, was sentenced to life imprisonment in 1947. His sentence was commuted in 1950, and he receives a monthly pension of 2,890 marks.11

The pampering of war criminals is not of recent date. It started in 1949, when, in quick succession, with an overwhelming majority, the Bundestag approved several laws in behalf of former Nazis. First came the abolition of death sentences; then an amnesty for all Nazi crimes except manslaughter and murder; then the 131 Law, which directed all federal, state, and municipal administrators to rehire almost every ex-Nazi; and finally came the Lastenausgleich, a special law under which billions of marks are dispensed each year to Hitler's most devoted followers, the expellees, in the form of pensions, grants-in-aid, low-interest loans for homes and businesses, restitution for lost property, and so on. The amount spent for the Lastenausgleich during 1959 alone came to nearly five billion marks.

It is significant that the builders of the Bonn Republic did not make a new beginning with the rehabilitation of those who had survived the Nazi persecution. They could
have made a law that would have demonstrated to the world that the nation was determined to purge itself completely of the Nazi past. They could have said: "Not a penny for Nazis and militarists before the last victim is rehabilitated." No such law was made, no such sign was given. The prevailing attitude in Bonn was bluntly expressed by a leading Adenauer cabinet member. The Minister of Justice, Thomas Dehler, stated in 1953 in Hamburg that "no compensation should be paid to victims of Nazis until justice is done to the whole German people." Sympathy for ex-Nazis has become a dominant factor in German life, reported an American magazine. "If a German lawyer wants to get a light sentence for his client, he need only remark in passing that the defendant once suffered in an Allied prisoner-of-war camp."

The so-called "New Germany" being rehabilitated with the multibillion-dollar aid from the United States became the grand benefactor of the Nazis and militarists.

According to the Esscher Tagblatt of June 17, 1952, the SS General Erich Reeder, the "bloody judge" of the military court in Brussels, convicted as a war criminal and set free under pressure of the Adenauer government, received "back pay" of 44,000 marks after his release, and was awarded a monthly pension of 1,400 marks. Similar high pensions were given to the SS General Walter Schroeder, once the Nazi Chief of Police of Lubeck, and to the SS General Judicke in Wiesbaden. The papers reported the granting of high pensions to Hitler's former Ministers Schacht, von Papen, and Ohnesorge, to the former Secretaries of the Chancellery Otto Meissner and Hans Lammers, to Goering's personal aide, Dr. Erich Gritzbach (1,300 marks), to Dr. Goebbels' aide, Herr von Zittwitz, and to the one-time aide to Alfred Rosenberg, Helmut Stallrecht.

On September 30, 1958, the Frankfurter Allgemeine published a report ("Into the Pockets of Former Nazis") which charged that year after year hundreds of millions of marks are paid to ex-Nazi officials. The long list contains the names of ex-Gauleiters, Nazi mayors, Gestapo officials, and concentration camp commanders. Among a dozen ex-Nazis who receive high pensions is Dr. Friedrich Krebs of Frankfurt, under whom 35,000 Jews were hounded out of the city. The former Lord Mayor of Stuttgart, Dr. Karl Stroelin, receives a monthly pension of 2,000 marks. Dr. Stroelin was once head of the Nazi Ausland Institute and was the chief promoter of subversive propaganda of the Nazi Bund in the United States.

Two of the top jurists in Hitler's courts, State Secretary Kurt Rothenberger and the Senior Prosecutor of the People's Court, Dr. Ernst Lautz, have been awarded monthly pensions of 2,000 marks and 1,600 marks respectively.* Rudolf Diels, the first chief of Hitler's Gestapo, was also given a high pension.

There have been countless reports of cases in which former Nazi officials filed claims in the amount of 100,000 marks and more for belongings lost in war action. One Nazi, the ex-Reichstag member Dr. Helmut Stallrecht, claimed damages of 90,000 marks for a manuscript on Nazi race theories which he had written and which had been lost at the end of the war. Very often the courts have given full recognition to such claims. In 1958 a member of the Bundestag, Jakob Altmaier, declared that each year almost two billion marks are paid to Hitler's Gauleiters, ministers, SS officers, and tens of thousands of "old fighters." From the Nazi Gauleiters down to Hitler's valet, a former SS guard, every Nazi was eligible for a comfortable pension from the Bonn Republic. The most celebrated case is probably that of a swineherd, who, in recognition of his early allegiance to Hitler, was

* The case of Dr. Lautz, who had demanded the death sentence for 400 people, stirred much criticism. In 1958 his pension was cut in half (Die Welt, April 12, 1959).
elevated in 1943 to the status of a Beamter, a state official appointed for life and eligible for a pension. The “old fighter” received his salary up to 1955, when someone discovered his past and decided it was a disgrace for a swineherd to be classified as a Beamter. His salary was canceled, and this would have ended the case, had it not been for the highest Federal Court and the 131 Law which provides for exNazis. The swineherd was reinstated as Beamter, and when he dies his relatives are eligible for a state pension.16

The I. G. Farbens, the Krupps, Flicks, and Mannesmanns have multiplied their fortunes. Sepp Dietrich and his colleagues are free and enjoy the financial blessings of the Bonn Republic. Men like Seebohm, Oberlaender, Schroeder, and Globke grace Dr. Adenauer’s official family. But fifteen years after the end of the war, more than a million victims are still waiting to be compensated for their past sufferings.

18 The Lost Generation

Early in 1959 an enterprising television reporter, Juergen Neven-DuMont, visited a dozen elementary and secondary schools in various parts of Germany, where he interviewed students between fourteen and seventeen years of age. In the glaring light of his TV cameras, the reporter put a few questions to hundreds of pupils in upper-grade classes: “What do you know about Adolf Hitler and the concentration camps?” “How many people were murdered under the Nazi regime?” The answers were startling. Nine out of ten students either had heard nothing of Hitler or knew him only as “the man with the funny black mustache” or “the builder of the Autobahns”—Germany’s superhighways. Some youngsters knew Hitler as “the ruler from 1933 to 1945” who “had arrested the criminals and had revived Germany.” Those who recited a few facts about the concentration camps and the anti-Semitic persecution said they had heard about this in their homes, not in the classrooms. They estimated that a “few thousand” had died in the concentration camps.

The teachers, also interviewed, hesitantly admitted that
recent German history is a delicate problem. They traced their pupils' ignorance chiefly to a "cramped curriculum" which allowed for little history since 1918. They gave other reasons. Some said that not enough time had passed for an objective history of the Hitler period to be written; others blamed parents who indoctrinated their children with a glamorized version of the Nazi past.

Fourteen years after the war, German students either professed ignorance of Hitler and his regime or thought Hitler had done "more good than harm." Die Welt of Hamburg commented: "There is something rotten in our schools." Careful surveys, however, established the fact that the majority of children knew more about Hitler and the Nazi past than they would admit publicly, and it was pointed out that they were merely imitating their parents, who prefer to keep silent when asked about the Hitler period. Flora Lewis, in a penetrating analysis in the New York Times, reported that there is "an almost nation-wide need to pull the blinds on the past."

German history textbooks which, under Allied occupation, contained fifty pages and more about the Nazi atrocities and concentration camps, are today completely revised and show great charity toward the Nazi record. The Hitler terror is mentioned in a few lines, but no facts and no figures are given. For example, a textbook for the upper grades of the elementary school deals with the mass extermination of Jews: "Jews fared worst under Hitler. They were expelled from the German people. They were shipped by the thousands into concentration camps. Because of hunger, diseases and maltreatment, many died."

There is a tendency not only to forget but to suppress the history of the Nazi past. In its 1949 edition, a widely used textbook, Man in Changing Times, had an eight-page description of the concentration camp terror; the 1958 edition makes no mention of this topic. The same 1949 edition strongly condemned the persecution of the Jews in more than three pages; the 1958 edition gives this subject fourteen lines. Most textbooks absolve the German people outright of any responsibility for the Nazi regime and even of knowledge of the atrocities in the concentration camps. Some textbooks minimize the Nazi crimes but glorify Hitler's military successes in World War II.* There are a few history books available which give a fuller account of the Nazi past, but these books are systematically ignored by the school authorities. The choice of textbooks is left entirely to the principals and teachers—a privilege much misused by the former Nazis.

As might be expected, many teachers in elementary and secondary schools often show Hitler and the Nazi system in a favorable light. Others simply skip the Nazi period entirely. A check of the top grades in 266 schools, made by the Ministry of Education in the State of Hesse, revealed that only 50 percent had devoted five hours or more to the history of the Nazi period and World War II. The rest had not gone beyond World War I, or had mentioned the Hitler regime only briefly.

Teachers frequently excuse themselves by pointing out that it is difficult to correct the false historical image their pupils have as long as the majority of parents harbor old Nazi ideologies and resentments. A survey in "one of Frankfurt's finest high schools" indicated that "even among well-educated German youth there were many who were highly prejudiced against the Jews . . . the prejudice of their parents had infected them." Anti-Semitism is sometimes expressed by students publicly in such statements as "Israel must vanish," or "Our fathers were Nazis and so are we." Rabbi Zvi Asaria, of the Synagogue in Cologne, has stated that

---

* This is particularly true in the following three textbooks for high schools: The Living Past (1952), Basic History (1956), and History from 1789 to the Present Day (1959).
most Germans have not reformed but have instead poisoned the young generation with their bias. The rabbi declared that Jewish children in various schools in Cologne are frequently insulted by other pupils with the old cliché: “It's a pity that you and your parents weren’t gassed by Hitler.”

According to Dr. Hanna Vogt, educational adviser to the State of Hesse, the attitude of some youngsters seems to be that “if so many Jews were killed by the Nazis, the Jews must have given some cause for the persecution.”

An analysis presented by the Frankfurter Allgemeine comes to the conclusion that a large majority of Germans “are still smarting under the trauma of the Thousand-Year Reich,” that there are “few teachers who can jump over the shadow of their National Socialist past,” and that the Nazi ideology “still lingers in many circles.”

Tests have shown that up to 70 percent of the German youth are indoctrinated with Nazi ideas and anti-Semitic concepts. Most of the youngsters have heard from their parents, relatives, or friends, that under Hitler the Jews and Slavs were killed by the millions. But they also know that it is not wise to admit openly that they have knowledge of these facts. The German masses are extremely conscious of the fact (and are often reminded by the press) that “the Ausland—the world abroad—is watching you,” and the old bias is often suppressed, not because of moral scruples but rather because of expediency, since open Nazi manifestations “have unfavorable repercussions abroad.” Thus the people seem to take refuge behind the generally accepted defense that “no living German had been a Nazi and none had participated in or condoned the Nazi crimes.”

A survey made by the American Jewish Congress gave a pointed description of the German attitude:

Many Germans were glad to accept the contention that the Nazis had not committed any crimes of magnitude. There were, to be sure, concentration camps, but the accounts of bestial treatment were flagrantly exaggerated. The inmates of those camps were reasonably well fed and cared for. The films shown to the German people by the occupation powers were fake. The figure of six million Jews was a fabrication. . . . In any event, the crimes of the Allies balanced the Nazi crimes and the suffering of the Jews was offset by the suffering of the Germans who endured bombardment of their cities and starvation through blockade. This rationalization of the past achieved two major purposes: It not only relieved the German people of the obligation to atone for their crimes against humanity but prepared the ground for the rehabilitation and reinstatement of the Nazi criminals into German life. . . . Slowly but surely the German people—except for a small minority—allowed themselves to be persuaded by the apologetics.

It is correct to say that the tremendous collective effort to repress the evil record of the Nazi past from the national conscience has created a nation of self-styled “historical illiterates.” When a hundred students from a teachers' college in Bavaria were questioned about the Nazi past, 75 percent pretended complete ignorance, and the rest showed only superficial knowledge of the Hitler period.

Again, when a group of fifty university students and young teachers were questioned about the number of Jews who perished under the Nazi terror, the majority said they had no knowledge of such killings. Only a few made estimates, with the highest figure given as 40,000. It is likely that more than 80 percent of the youth of voting age have never acquired accurate information about the Nazi regime and the events that brought about the German defeat of 1945. Yet it is obvious that Nazi doctrines are very much alive. A report in Die Welt declared: “We must take it for granted that the virus of Nazi propaganda is still present. Everything that Hitler, Rosenberg, and Streicher’s Sturmer once preached about the Jews is still alive.” The report goes on to say:
In most schools, there is a lack of readiness to touch the hot iron. . . . There is a general reluctance (on the part of the teachers) to discuss such themes as National Socialism and the Jewish question. . . . The number of teachers who are willing to preach tolerance and convey a true understanding of the Nazi past to their students seems to be alarmingly small.\textsuperscript{14}

Threats and intimidations are made against those who dare to explain the character of the Nazi regime and against newspapermen who publish stories about the way Nazism is taught in the schools. The \textit{Frankfurter Allgemeine} published a report about a regional conference of educators, at which young teachers complained about intimidation by older colleagues, school directors, and government officials when they tried to deal critically with the Nazi period. It was charged that "senior teachers and school directors only pay lip service to the democratic institutions" and that the glorification of nationalistic ideals is prevalent.\textsuperscript{15} In a letter to \textit{Die Welt}, a young teacher reported that he was advised by the director of his school not to speak adversely about National Socialism. The significant hint was: "Why should such times not come again?" In his letter the teacher asked the editors not to publish his name or the town where his school is located.\textsuperscript{16}

On March 28, 1959, the \textit{Frankfurter Rundschau} printed a long story about a newspaperwoman in Bremen, Frau Lilo Weinsheimer, who had shown in several articles how the topic of Nazism was evaded in the schools and had warned against the growing neo-Nazi influence in youth organizations. Frau Weinsheimer received several threatening phone calls. One anonymous voice told her: "Either you stop your criticism or we will hang you." Similar threats were made against the director of a high school in Erlangen, Dr. Herbert Paulus, for having permitted a lecturer at the school to describe Hitler as a "dangerous psychopath."\textsuperscript{17}

A large number of children of former Hitler followers have been organized in Nazi-type youth organizations. At least 70,000 indoctrinated youngsters, many of them sporting Nazi-syle uniforms, constitute the hard core of the Federation of Rightist Youth Organizations. These neo-Nazi youth groups are known under such names as Eagle, Viking, German Youth, Kyffhaeuser Youth, and German National Student Alliance. Little is done by the authorities to stem this trend. German officials have said that "the problem is complicated further by the glamorized versions of the Nazi era which young West Germans repeatedly encounter in mass-circulation illustrated magazines and in some motion pictures."\textsuperscript{18}

German school authorities, by their own account, have not been capable of overcoming the resentment of teachers and parents against a factual evaluation of the Hitler era. Education from the elementary school to the universities is administered by the ten individual German states. Although the states have coordinated their efforts by setting up a Permanent Council of the West German Educational State Ministries, the implementation of the directives depends entirely on the good will of the school authorities. Unfortunately most officials on the supervisory level are old Nazis who are in no way eager to embark on an ideological crusade which condemns their own past.

The educational picture is complicated by the fact that other federal agencies are working in quite different directions. The Bundeszentrale fuer Heimatdienst (Federal Agency for Domestic Affairs) issues factual material about the Nazi past for the enlightenment of the German public. Very few teachers, however, are inclined to use this material in the classrooms. In an interview with the \textit{Sueddeutsche Zeitung}, Dr. Schweitzer, the secretary of the agency, stated that the teachers "are flooded with books and brochures which extol the nationalistic spirit of the recent past."\textsuperscript{19} This propaganda material is financed directly or indirectly by
various federal ministries, such as the Bundeswehr and the Ministry for All-German Affairs, which exclusively advocate the fight against Communism and the liberation of the lost territories in the East. This of course is political fare much more appropriate to the nationalistic taste of the majority of the German teachers than dwelling on the sins of the Nazi regime.

When Westerners or representatives of Jewish organizations visit Bonn, they are shown the efforts made by the Bundesszentrale fuer Heimatdienst. There Western visitors see the brochures and posters which are aimed at instilling public officials, teachers, and students with an objective view of the Nazi past. However, foreigners are not told that this material is not accepted and not used by the overwhelming majority of teachers and students. In his interview with the Sueddeutsche Zeitung, Dr. Schweitzer went on to say:

The Heimatdienst has no illusions as to whether its material is really used in the classrooms. . . . The agency has issued documentary reports, testimony of eye witnesses and factual data about the persecution of Jews and the mass extermination in the gas chambers. Ten thousand copies of a book were distributed to all history teachers. Thus there is no lack of source material. If the pupils are not acquainted with the Nazi past, it is entirely the fault of the teachers.

What the student reads is often a distorted view of history. In the German schoolbooks one finds the old intoxication with the "invincibility" of Prussia and the imperial Reich; the glorification of munitions czar Alfried Krupp; the "encircling of Germany by greedy enemies"; the suffering under the Versailles Treaty; Hitler's rise to power and unification of all German-speaking peoples; France and Britain's "declaration of war on Germany" (but with no explanation of why); Hitler's blitzkrieg victories; Germany's "heroic fight against Bolshevism"; the "horror nights under Allied bomb-
others have organized annual pilgrimages to the mass graves at former concentration camp sites, and students at the University of Goettingen even staged successful demonstrations which led to the ouster of the Minister of Education, Leonard Schlueter, a nationalistic demagogue. But unfortunately these democratic youth groups are not held up as praiseworthy examples. They have found neither the hearty support of the Bonn administration nor that of the Lander. For the purpose of window dressing, the existence of these democratic groups is loudly advertised in Bonn's propaganda abroad, but in Germany proper they are viewed with suspicion. They are regarded as "too re-educated." If they dare to criticize the presence of former Nazis in high cabinet positions, they are branded as "fellow travelers" and are harassed and even threatened by the police.

The attempts at educating a new democratic generation must contend with many problems. Most young Germans are attracted by the economic boom and are absorbed in their efforts to share in the prosperity. In addition, they are fed nationalist reading matter of all kinds. An AP dispatch from Bonn told of action taken by a censorship board against the book Of War and Peace, written by Colonel Hans Ulrich Rudel. The board, charged with banning publications regarded as "dangerous to the youth," classified Rudel's work as "a hate and propaganda book against the present democratic order." The AP dispatch went on to say that "hundreds of war-adventure booklets have been flooding the West German market lately." The booklets "usually portray the Germans as super-heroes" and "always deal with sex, sadism and brutality." They obviously suit the taste of a large majority of German youngsters, for the war stories are bought in such quantities that this trade has become very profitable. The report says that in the past "publishers have sold several million of the booklets each month for fifteen cents each." 22

Perhaps it is not surprising that there are a number of flourishing nationalistic youth organizations, thoroughly trained and indoctrinated. These Rightist groups are driven by a fanatical ideology, deeply rooted in the Nazi past. They enjoy the backing of influential circles in the Bundeswehr, in industry, and among reactionary government officials. No less a figure than the director of the Department of Political Science at Bonn University, Professor Bracher, warned that the existence of ultra-Rightist groups and their affiliated nationalistic youth organizations "constitute a latent danger which in a time of crisis could lead to fatal consequences." 23

The 850 anti-Semitic outrages officially reported during the first six weeks of 1960, committed mainly by young people between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five, are a clear indication of the present danger. It does not speak well for the Western powers or for the Adenauer administration that another "lost generation" has grown up in Germany.
PART FOUR

Image and Reality
Behind the Adenauer Façade

Several years ago the able Washington bureau chief of the New York Times, James Reston, made this striking observation: “There has been a growing tendency in Washington since the war for the government to put out not what it knows to be true, but what it wants the people to believe to be true.”

What does the State Department want the people to believe to be true about Germany? First, that the decision to transform the defeated enemy into an ally was a wise one; second, that the Germans have changed profoundly and have formed a truly democratic society; third, that in Chancellor Konrad Adenauer the Germans have found a leader and statesman whose counsel is sought throughout the Western world.

It was mainly on the basis of this last point—the Adenauer image—that the State Department and the Pentagon succeeded in gaining the support of the American people for a close alliance with the Bonn Republic. During the early postwar years America’s feeling about Germany was still affected by knowledge of her Nazi past. The very word “German” was
in ill repute—it was generally equated with "Nazi." In a survey made as late as 1958 by the Gilbert Youth Research Organization, hundreds of young people between fourteen and nineteen years of age gave the following responses when the word "German" was mentioned: "Nazis ... war ... concentration camps ... persecution ... Hitler ... falling bombs." 2 The report noted that the teen-agers were "influenced by old war movies [on TV] and by the still vivid recollections of parents and older friends who lived through those years of atrocities and propaganda."

Given our alliance, it was obvious that there was a need to obliterate the existing picture of Germany and supplant it with a new one. The American people were told that Adenauer had emerged as a forceful democratic leader untainted by the German past, an outstanding politician, and a statesman of historic significance.

The success story of the first Chancellor of the Federal Republic is indeed a remarkable one. When Adenauer entered German national politics in his early seventies, many of his younger colleagues were firmly convinced that the Lord Mayor of Cologne—well known as a conservative, nationalist, and stubborn egocentric—was no longer a man of much political significance. Even after Adenauer had reached some prominence as a politician in the Rhineland, there were few who believed his career could go further. Delbert Clark pictured him as "a bad-tempered but extremely astute reactionary." In his party he was regarded as "the great symbol of extreme political toryism," and a former admirer described him as "a malicious old man." 3

"The Old Fox," as he was called by friend and foe, proved his superior political acumen by outsmarting dozens of younger but equally ambitious contenders in the field of party politics. In 1949 the Bundestag elected him with a one-vote majority—his own—as the first Federal Chancellor of the newly formed West German state. At that time the Bonn Republic was still under the tutelage of the victors. The three Western High Commissioners had supreme authority and ruled on the basis of an occupation statute.

For Konrad Adenauer it was a difficult uphill struggle in every respect. He had to consolidate his position as leader of his party, he had to establish his authority as Chancellor and secure majorities in the Bundestag, and he had to whittle down the supreme power of the Allied High Commissioners in order to obtain full sovereignty for the Bonn Republic. Dr. Adenauer accomplished all three feats almost simultaneously—sometimes operating alone, but more often with support from Washington.

When Adenauer became Chancellor in 1949, his name was completely unknown to the American public. Most European and American newspapermen, however, were skeptical about the new German leader. They doubted his sincerity and trustworthiness and quoted his party friends who described him "as an old fox whose obstinacy is matched only by his capacity for intrigue." 4

Despite these unfavorable press reports, Dr. Adenauer had made a strong impression on U.S. government officials. General Lucius Clay described the Chancellor as an "interesting personality" and a "capable politician" who has "the intelligence and character to act as a statesman." 5 With the growing East-West tension, the German military potential became important to Washington. Dr. Adenauer, who had proposed German remilitarization long before he was elected Chancellor, became a favorite of the Pentagon and the State Department. With the blessing of Washington, a publicity campaign was launched in America which presented Konrad Adenauer as an almost legendary statesman. The Bonn government retained a New York public-relations firm whose main task was to promote the Adenauer image.

When the German Chancellor made his first official visit to the United States in April 1953, he scored a great diplo-
matic success with the new Eisenhower administration. During his coast-to-coast tour American newspapermen pointed out that the Chancellor possessed a “most unusually sharp instinct for publicity.” In San Francisco, Adenauer addressed a gathering of seven hundred prominent representatives of the political and economic world at the Commonwealth Club. He spoke before huge press conferences, meetings of the Foreign Policy Association, exclusive clubs, and universities. At Harvard, Chancellor Adenauer was introduced by Dr. Conant to a distinguished academic gathering. It was a success which, according to Adenauer’s biographer, “no European statesman had yet been able to achieve in the United States.” Here is the story in round figures:

Sixty million Americans, it was estimated, had seen the German Federal Chancellor on their television screens. Five hundred American radio stations had devoted a daily average of ten minutes to news broadcasts on the Chancellor’s visit. More than five thousand newspaper articles had been written about him, and over one thousand different photographs were published in the papers. And some fifteen thousand movie theaters all over the United States had shown newsreels of his visit.

Bonn left nothing to chance in its effort to build up Dr. Adenauer as the great crusader for democracy and Western ideals. According to a German press report, the cost of these public-relations activities amounted to the staggering sum of no less than twelve million dollars!

Adenauer had shown himself to be a master of publicity and timing. His tour through the United States was the opening move in the election campaign for the Bundestag. His biographer pointed out that the CDU focused their election campaign on Adenauer, and that his successful mission to the United States “was now redounding to his credit with the German public in general.” Dr. Adenauer earned prestige and new votes by the millions in his homeland. When the election returns came in on September 6, 1953, the votes for the CDU had surged from 7,000,000 in 1949 to 12,500,000.

Adenauer, says Paul Weymar, was presented to Americans as the wise reformer of the “New Germany,” a stanch democrat and firm friend of the United States, a leader “to match with the great Churchill himself,” a statesman who had become the “passionate defender of Western civilization.”

There is no doubt that publicity efforts in Adenauer’s behalf were effective. It was difficult to sustain the memories of tortures and mass atrocities, concentration camps and charnel houses, and the rape and pillage of a dozen European nations when confronted with the painstakingly created image of the upright Chancellor. The German people, Adenauer assured his listeners, have reformed and “they will never forget this lesson.” Declaring that the “democratic heritage of ideas is alive and strong” in Germany, the Chancellor said: “There can be no serious talk about the danger of neo-Nazism, or right-wing radical influence on the federal government.”

Year after year, Dr. Adenauer returned to the United States. And gradually the term “Adenauer’s Germany” began to establish in people’s minds the concept of a “New Germany.” When in early 1960 the wave of anti-Semitic outbursts aroused world-wide indignation, Adenauer made arrangements with his New York public-relations firm, Roy Bernard, “for a new and much wider campaign to present a favorable picture of Germany to the American public.” Indeed, his visit to the United States in March 1960 had all the characteristics of a high-powered publicity campaign. According to the semi-official monthly Aussenpolitik, Dr. Adenauer scored an extraordinary success:

Within nine days, Dr. Adenauer delivered 12 long addresses, 22 speeches and held four news conferences. He appeared as guest at 14 official banquets, and he had 20 individual conferences, each lasting half an hour. He conferred with Eisenhower, Nixon, Hertter and other officials for several hours. The whole schedule
allows us to draw a significant conclusion: The fact cannot be overlooked that the information given to the public by the visiting statesman is equally important to his contacts with top officials in Washington.¹⁰

During his press interviews and speeches, the Chancellor assured his listeners again and again that there were no more Nazis in Germany and that the rash of swastika-daubings was the handiwork of nonpolitical teen-agers, drunks, cranks, and "a few Communists."

There is no doubt that for a great many people these are satisfactory answers and that the large-scale publicity offensive has had the desired effect. And there is more to come. In a full-page article, the Deutsche Zeitung, a voice of German heavy industry, recently described the long-planned establishment of a German propaganda center in New York. Its task will be to create "smooth relations with the press and other communications media," to establish "close contacts with academic circles and with leading representatives of business, and to court those personalities whose liaison activities are indispensable to the creation of good will and in presenting to the public the German point of view."¹¹

The following organizations were named as leading agents in Bonn's propaganda efforts: the German-American societies, Goethe House in New York, the American Council on Germany, described as the "mouthpiece for German interests," and a "number of public-relations firms retained by Volkswagen, Mannesmann, and other large German companies."

In one way or another these organizations and agencies present an optimistic picture of modern Germany that often bears little relation to reality. Certainly it is a flat distortion of the truth when Dr. Adenauer assures British and American audiences on television that there are no Nazis in Germany. The German Chancellor must know from the reports of his Minister of the Interior that the Bonn Republic is studded with hundreds of Nazi-type organizations. It is interesting to note that in 1956 New York Times correspondent A. J. Olsen reported that Bonn officials keep 100 extreme Rightist groups under surveillance, "all rating the neo-Nazi label." Officials stated that "there are at least 35 youth groups among the Right radical organizations; most are fitted out with romantic names . . . with uniforms patterned after the Hitler Youth outfit." The Bonn officials told Olsen that "a number of Right radical leaders could be picked up any time on charges of subversive activity. The official policy is to ignore them as long as they pursue their present ineffectual rounds."¹² In May 1960 the Prosecutor General in the State of Hesse, Dr. Fritz Bauer, announced after a thorough investigation of the records of a former high Hitler Youth official, Karl-Heinz Priester, that this Nazi leader had kept contact with no less than "800 groups and organizations of neo-Nazi character."¹³

There is another aspect of the Adenauer portrait which, in the eyes of many observers, does not faithfully represent the original. Much has been said and written about Adenauer as the "stanch democratic leader," who has laid the foundations for constitutional freedom and democratic order under law in the traditionally autocratic Germany. The truth is, as most Germans know, that Dr. Adenauer throughout his life has ruled with the iron hand of an autocrat, first as Lord Mayor of Cologne, then as Chancellor of the Federal Republic. Dozens of German cartoons have depicted Konrad Adenauer as the strict disciplinarian, holding the whip hand over Parliament and his cabinet, presiding like a headmaster over an unruly class. "Der Alte" ("The Old Man") is actually feared by his closest aides, cabinet members, and his own party deputies in the Bundestag. Professor Theodor Eschenburg, a leading German authority on constitutional law, recently compared Adenauer's rule with that of a "medieval king" who held sway over his principality by absolute power.¹⁴ For Adenauer, the constitution exists only as a convenient democratic window display. There is no cabinet deliberation
such as that known in the West. The British newspaper correspondent Brian Connell reports about Adenauer: “There is in him the tendency toward intolerance that seems a characteristic of almost every German politician. . . . When asked, during his first government, whether he could get cabinet approval of a particular measure, he answered bluntly: ‘Don’t worry, I am at least 70 percent of that cabinet.’” 15

Many German democrats believe that even this is an understatement, that Adenauer alone is the cabinet and his ministers are just orderlies. In 1950 the Minister of the Interior, Dr. Gustav Heinemann, was forced to resign after having rebelled against the Chancellor’s rearmament policy. Adenauer had insisted on total agreement by his cabinet. 16

Charles Thayer points to the Chancellor’s “steamroller tactics in Parliament and his tendency to make minor sacrifices of ethics to political expediency.” Thayer also feels that the majority of Germans vote for Adenauer as a popular political figure “because he fulfills the traditional German dream of a strong man.” 17

Granted that grave psychological and political mistakes were made by American and British military authorities during the first few years of the occupation. Granted further that, with the stepped-up cold war, Allied denazification policies became unpleasant and cumbersome burdens which the Western powers wanted to get rid of as quickly as possible. All this does not free Dr. Adenauer from the responsibility for the present situation. The Chancellor himself has contributed enormously to the present mental and moral confusion by stubbornly championing cabinet members, top advisers, and other high officials whose unsavory Nazi records had been publicly discussed throughout the nation. It was Adenauer who demanded, in 1951, that the opposition should halt its “snooping around in Nazi records.” It was Adenauer who steadfastly stood by his Secretary of the Chancellery, Dr. Globke, and it was Adenauer who defended his cabinet member, Dr. Oberlaender, in spite of his Nazi past.

No one has ever suggested that Adenauer himself was a Nazi or a sympathizer of Nazism. Yet this refusal on the part of the Chancellor to take a principled stand on ousting those of his officials with dubious records has had a catastrophic effect on the moral climate of a sick nation.

The great majority of the Germans are quite satisfied with the way “The Old Man” is running the affairs of the state. Under him Germany has gone a long way toward regaining her position as a world power, and that is all that matters.
A Dependable Ally?

A few years after the second collapse the Germans were on their feet again. Energetically they went to work rebuilding their shattered cities and regaining their prewar production levels.

Today the Federal Republic is the strongest economic and military power in Europe. For the last ten years Germany has enjoyed an unprecedented boom, the so-called Wirtschaftswunder. With more than seven billion dollars in gold and foreign exchange in her coffers, Germany has become the strongest financial power next to the United States. The Federal Republic has even pushed Great Britain from second place as an industrial exporter.

The boom on Rhine and Ruhr surges on with unabated strength. Because West Germany is short of manpower, tens of thousands of foreign workers have had to be imported from Spain, Italy, and other countries. By the middle of 1960 there were 550,000 jobs going begging. Only a little more than 100,000 persons are registered as unemployed; they are either sick or belong in the category of those considered unfit for work.

With regained vitality, Germany is back in circulation. From all corners of the world come reports telling of a stepped-up German trade offensive. During the war Germany attacked her neighbors with Stukas, tanks, and submarines; today she conquers with machines, cameras, and Volkswagens. In addition, the Bonn Republic is building a modern army, which they are pressing to have equipped with long-range missiles and nuclear weapons.

Although limited to a relatively small area in the heart of Europe, divided Germany is regarded in European capitals as the world's biggest problem nation. How will this dynamic country use its regained strength, in what direction will it move, and what will be its ultimate aims? Both East and West fear or distrust a Germany which has re-entered the stage of world politics with such unmistakable vigor.

The question of how to control Germany is answered differently in every capital. Washington wants a Germany closely allied to the United States via NATO. American policy planners fear that a freewheeling and uncontrolled Germany may soon become very troublesome. In 1958 the following exchange took place between the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and Senator George Aiken in a hearing on foreign policy in the U. S. Senate:

SENATOR AIKEN “After the end of World War II, Germany was divided to make sure that that nation was not a threat to the peace of the world a third time. . . . Is it your opinion that if East and West Germany should be reunited, the country might again in the future be a threat to the peace of Europe and possibly the whole world? . . .”

SECRETARY DULLES “I think it is very important, Senator, that a reunited Germany should be integrated into the West through its association with NATO. . . . I believe that a Germany which was left in a position of neutrality, or some people call it disengagement, in the center of Europe, would be under an almost irresistible temptation to play one side or the other, and that that
would be a very dangerous situation, dangerous for the West, dangerous for the Soviet Union, and dangerous for the Germans themselves."  

Paris, quite understandably, has even stronger fears. France in the past has always been one of the first victims of German aggression. It is precisely for this reason that General de Gaulle wants West German economic and military power closely tied to a European federation which he thinks can be controlled by a revitalized France.

London would like to see a Germany economically linked to the West but limited in its military establishment and controlled by international treaty arrangements.

Moscow wants a demilitarized or a neutralized Germany, unattached to any power bloc, limited to conventional weapons, and controlled by a four-power agreement. The Soviets are convinced that a resurrected Germany, armed with missiles and nuclear weapons, would some day plunge the world into another disaster.

Out of this common fear a tacit understanding has grown in the East and West that it would serve no good purpose if the two German states were to be reunited. The nightmare of the Western powers is that the Soviet Union will some day play her "German card." As Walter Lippmann and others have pointed out, only Russia is in a position to reunify Germany. She can at any time begin negotiations with Bonn that would turn Germany against the West. Such a Russo-German rapprochement is a possibility that haunts statesmen and diplomats in all Western capitals.

Historians are well aware of the long record of close collaboration between Russia and Germany. From the time of Frederick the Great to Bismarck's "Reinsurance Treaty" to the Rapallo Treaty in the Weimar Republic, and to the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939, expediency has always governed Russo-German relations. In an excellent study on this subject, Edward Hallett Carr has shown the effectiveness of the old seesaw policy which enabled the German government "to manoeuvre freely between East and West, playing off the two rivals against one another, disclaiming any firm or irrevocable commitment to either, extorting concessions from this one by threatening to fall into the arms of the other, and always keeping its own choice open."  

The same formula is dominant behind the Adenauer façade. During the postwar years, former Ribbentrop diplomats, geopolitical experts within Adenauer's own party, and leading industrialists from Rhine and Ruhr have openly advocated a policy of close collaboration with Moscow. The fact that the Germans are vehement anti-Communists does not necessarily mean that they are not free to play a shrewd game of Realpolitik. Hitler's pact with Stalin is remembered in Germany to this day as the greatest diplomatic accomplishment of the Fuehrer's career. On the other hand, Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union is widely regarded as his gravest mistake. In 1955, when Dr. Adenauer visited Moscow, Alistair Horne, the London Daily Telegraph correspondent in Bonn, reported that Adenauer's trip caused "almost universal jubilation in the Federal Republic."  

The popular Western view of the Bonn Republic as a bulwark against Communism is a dangerous illusion, nourished by German propaganda. No German statesman or government would hesitate for a moment to strike a bargain with Moscow if the Kremlin were willing to make an attractive offer, such as the return of the lost provinces or a new partition of Poland.

When in 1949 the foreign press revealed that a group of ultraconservative businessmen and diplomats (among them Dr. Herman Puender, banker Hermann Abs, ex-Minister Dr. Andreas Hermes, Professor Ludwig Ehrhard, and ex-Ambassador Count Rudolf Nadolny) had discussed the possibilities of Russo-German collaboration, Dr. Adenauer admonished
his party friends to be extremely careful: “We must move very cautiously. We ought not to give the impression, either in Germany or in the United States, that we shall collaborate in any way with the Russians.”

There have been frequent hints in the Adenauer press that the Chancellor was pursuing a “tremendously bold plan” of first consolidating a United Europe and then turning to the East to make a deal with Moscow: “The Chancellor is stubborn but he is a realist. . . . He follows the correct thesis of doing two things at the same time: namely, to increase our strength by cooperation with the West, and not neglecting the other, to come to an agreement with the East.”

In 1954, four former Chancellors of the Reich (Dr. Heinrich Bruening, Franz von Papen, Dr. Hans Luther, and Dr. Joseph Wirth) appeared before influential gatherings, such as the exclusive Rhine-Ruhr Club, advocating a new Rapallo policy and a friendly understanding with Moscow.

In 1955, Dr. Adenauer solicited his own invitation to Moscow, where he had long secret talks with Bulganin and Khrushchev which resulted in the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Federal Republic and the Soviet Union. In Moscow, Dr. Adenauer brought tumultuous applause in the packed Bolshoi Theatre when he embraced Bulganin in a well-staged gesture. Satisfied with his visit, the Chancellor praised the Soviet Union as “an immense world power that has to be accepted as a reality,” and he stated that “Bulganin and Khrushchev are men whose words I fully trust.”

Leaving Moscow, Dr. Adenauer vowed to the press:

I swear that we haven’t signed any secret agreement and that furthermore the Soviet Union never has at any point in the negotiations asked us to abandon the Western alliance and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization . . . We believe that what we have done here will help the cause of peace in Europe and all the world.

Adenauer’s performance in Moscow was reminiscent of Germany’s Rapallo policy of 1923 and the Hitler-Stalin pact of the fateful year of 1939. The New York Times printed this comment:

The whole concept of dealing with the Soviet Union from strength has collapsed overnight. . . . It is one of the ironies of public life that Dr. Adenauer, the archpriest of the policy of strength, the inspirer of Western intransigence against concessions, the man who cautioned Washington against weakness at the Big Four Geneva conference, should today be the author and defender of a policy he abhorred less than ten days ago.

Under the leadership of Adenauer the Germans are today admired as the crusaders for a United Europe. However, the loudly demonstrated support given by most Germans for the idea of a United Europe should not be considered an indication that the cadres of Hitler’s master race have been transformed overnight into a society of cooperative Europeans. For many years now, Switzerland, Austria, and other European countries have raised their warning voices: “They talk of Europe, but what they have in mind is a Gross Deutschland—a Greater Germany.”

The European commentator of the Christian Science Monitor, Ernest S. Pisko, reported not long ago that Nazis and nationalists are backing the United Europe idea and that a “vast amount of nationalist thought has crept almost unnoticed into the officially sponsored supranationalism of the postwar period.” Mr. Pisko further states:

These hard-core Nazis . . . have for the past nine years made a determined effort to reach their goal by swimming with the current. They have, figuratively speaking, hitched their trailer, piled with all the impediments of radical nationalism, to the tractor of supranationalism. They ride waving a flag with the inscription “Onward to Nation Europe” and under this slogan, which seems to support and parallel the efforts of the truly sincere
Europeans, they hide their plans for establishment of a radically oriented, dictatorially ruled, and German-dominated “Third Force” strong enough to let them talk on even terms with both East and West.  

Thus German nationalism is still the critical mass that some day may cause another chain reaction engulfing Europe and the entire globe. Washington, which has backed a strong Germany and European integration, is hopeful that nothing unpleasant will happen during the next few years. There is widespread apprehension in Britain, however, that the rapidly growing economic and military power in Germany will some day result in the complete domination of the European continent. In a recent analysis, the Paris bureau chief of the Christian Science Monitor reported British fears that a resurgent Germany “may threaten to repeat its past aggression in trying to dominate all Europe.” Germany’s long-term strategy is to weaken France with the help of former collaborationists, and to transform Europe into a greater German Lebensraum. According to the Monitor, after General de Gaulle’s exit there will be “no other leader in an otherwise politically soft France to prevent it from quickly yielding to a powerful Germany, particularly within the structure of the United Europe of the Common Market.” The Monitor quoted British officials as saying: “Dr. Adenauer cannot be expected to stay in power very much longer and . . . there is no one to replace him and hold back the ambitious German forces.”

The question whether Germany can again become a threat to the world will be determined to a large extent by the domestic developments in a nation which has so often baffled her neighbors during past centuries. If conditions remain as they are now in the Federal Republic there is little danger of a Nazi or nationalist upheaval. But if there is a recession of the present prosperity or if a political crisis should arise, such an upheaval is entirely possible. Nothing radical, how-
"A Policy of Calculated Risk"

After the Second World War, Washington's policy planners in great haste transformed our former enemy into a close ally. The State Department called the approach toward the new Germany "a policy of calculated risk" based on realistic optimism. Once before we tried a similar experiment when America helped in rebuilding a strong Germany after the First World War, and almost overnight that "reformed" Germany of Weimar was replaced by the Third Reich of Adolf Hitler.

It should be noted that the picture of Germany presented here is far from complete. There are other important areas in German life which have been excluded from consideration in order to deal more fully with the central theme of this book—whether or not Nazism is still alive. There is no doubt that these other problems are closely related to the main issue. For example: the return of Nazi industrialists and bankers to their former positions of power—the Krupps and Flicks and Hitler's bankers, Hermann Abs and Robert Pferdmenges—symbolizes the restoration of the old aggressive Germany. Abs and Pferdmenges were on the Allied war criminal list, but both remained unprosecuted.* Minister-President Meyers of North Rhine-Westphalia has stated that more efficient controls over Germany's economic captains on Rhine and Ruhr are needed. They had wrecked the Weimar Republic and they are a potential danger to the Bonn Republic. "Only a single financial tycoon," says Herr Meyers, "is necessary for the support of another Hitler, and all security measures to uphold the democratic order would prove to be inadequate." ¹

The return of the rulers of Rhine and Ruhr constitutes a problem of such prime importance for the future safety of Europe and the world that it can only be treated appropriately in a separate study. The same is true in regard to the essential facts behind Germany's rapidly growing army, the Bundeswehr. Led by Hitler's younger General Staff officers, the Bonn military planners have recently demanded the most modern weapons for their new divisions—Polaris missiles and nuclear bombs.²

I have left a variety of subjects largely undiscussed: namely, German reunification; the political ineffectiveness of the German labor unions and the Social Democratic party; the United Europe plan, advocated so strongly by Dr. Adenauer; NATO's role as an umbrella for German rearmament; Bonn's far-reaching geopolitical plans in the Middle East and Africa; and a great number of other important problems.

It will be argued that although a large segment of the German people still cling to Nazi ideas, there must be many, perhaps the majority, who have become reconciled to the present system of a "Chancellor democracy." The fact is that Dr. Adenauer's autocratic rule has had a blighting effect on the
tender democratic roots that sprouted under a well-phrased constitution. Most Germans, understandably, have accepted the domineering regime of "Der Alte."

The democratic forces, as we have seen, are far too weak to serve as an effective bulwark against the return of militarism, jingoism, and Nazism, and there is justified fear that the trend is rapidly toward an authoritarian state.

The fact that today there is no large organized Nazi party, according to Charles Thayer, "does not dispose of the danger of another dictatorship." Thayer also points out that "many editors, politicians and commentators have grave doubts about Germany's ability to survive under a parliamentary system." ³

Unfortunately the United States did not help create a climate for democracy when the country was occupied in 1945. The tragedy, as Delbert Clark has pointed out, is that from the beginning of the occupation the U. S. Military Government gave little or no encouragement to the few potential German leaders who had democratic or antimilitaristic sentiments. The democratic forces were simply "ignored or brushed aside in favor of the old-line Nazis who thrived during the Hitler regime." What Clark wrote in 1949 is still valid:

Today the "little men" of Germany are unchanged, awaiting only a new leader to tell them what to do. They believe in authority and are lost without it. Democracy to them means American folkways, American political forms, carbonated soft drinks, chewing gum, baseball and anti-Communism. The real spirit of democracy has never been made clear to them.⁴

The Germans have never experienced real democracy. To them democracy is a strange concept, entirely alien to their national heritage. This was strongly emphasized by the ideological interpreter and co-founder of Dr. Adenauer's party, Professor Friedrich von der Heydte. Stating that twice after the Germans were defeated, in 1918 and 1945, the "idea of democracy was brought by the victorious enemy together with the army of occupation," Professor von der Heydte pointed out that in the eyes of every German "democracy is linked with collapse, defeat, and foreign uniforms stalking German soil." In the Rheinischer Merkur, he goes on to say:

Today it is fashionable in Germany to be a democrat. Every German is a good democrat as a matter of course—if you want to "belong" you have to be. But basically the Germans do not cherish democracy. They submit to it as perhaps people submit to a fashion, although deep inside they resent their uncomfortable plight.⁵

This frank description of Germany's real feeling toward democracy was published in the leading ideological paper of the CDU while Dr. Adenauer was on his first visit to the United States. It did not hinder the Chancellor from assuring his audiences in America that "the democratic heritage of ideas is alive and strong in Germany."

A Bonn government official stated the case quite clearly to an American correspondent: "You know, we Germans will always be willing to obey the man who drops the coin into the slot machine." He said further that the German people "would discard their democratic vestments without hesitation the moment a new and more dictatorial leader elbowed his way to the slot machine dispensing offices, honors, and profits." ⁶ This means that a new Fuehrer could be backed by an authoritarian clique, entrenched in industry, bureaucracy and the army; he would not necessarily have to depend on the noisy support of marching storm troopers, mass rallies, flag waving, and all the other trappings of the Hitler period.

It is clear that we made two basic errors in our policy. First, we believed that if we gave the Germans prosperity—if they were well fed and well housed—and, in addition, if we gave
them the opportunity to vote, they would be safe for democracy. The problem is not that simple.

Second, we were naïve enough to assume that if we integrated the Germans into NATO we could pacify and control them. We hoped, furthermore, that Germany's neighbors would soon forget the past. This has also turned out to be an illusion. We have indeed prodded the Europeans into acceptance of Germany as a military partner, but they do not trust the new ally.

We have spent billions of dollars to rehabilitate the defeated enemy—we have made Germany a going concern up to a point where she has become strong in the world market. We have made Germany the center of our cold-war policy against the Soviet bloc, and we have stationed 250,000 of our best troops between Rhine and Elbe.

Nevertheless, our efforts in Germany have achieved neither democracy nor military security. Despite his strength, Adenauer has been barely able to keep the Nazis and nationalists in line. Soon the old leadership will have to give way to the younger forces. They will not be bound by gratitude to the United States; they will work for German interests only.

Will the post-Adenauer politicians destroy the Bonn Republic as effectively as their fathers strangled the Weimar Republic thirty years ago?

At the beginning of 1960 the Rheinischer Merkur published several editorials and articles which pointed with alarm to the internal situation in present-day Germany. In brief, the paper contends that: a] the Nazi invasion of the federal government and the administration of the Laender is an established fact; b] the return of Nazi judges to the judiciary has created an intolerable situation; and c] the packing of schools and universities with ardent Nazi teachers and their promotion to key positions must be regarded as a public danger. This appraisal by the Merkur indicates that the conservative (but anti-Nazi) wing in Dr. Adenauer's own party feels the country's security threatened by the growing power of the nationalistic, militaristic, and neo-Nazi elements. The failure to stop this growth is accepted by the paper as evidence that "the Hitler spirit, still harbored by the German people [Hitler in uns] has belatedly triumphed to an unbelievable degree." 8

When a paper such as the Merkur appeals to the Bundestag and the Laender parliaments to apply stern measures and to "take control over the executive," the situation has obviously become critical. The editorial demands an "end to the schizophrenic two-faced policy" in the Federal Republic and asks the legislators to "clean up the plague-ridden ministries by using the instrument of the investigative powers." 9 Apparently the feeling is that Adenauer has shown himself unwilling to press for the necessary reform.

These warning voices, coming from leading conservative circles, should no longer be ignored in America. If past records and present performances have any meaning, we should pause to consider whether we have correctly evaluated the potential of our ally and whether our foreign policy in regard to the German Federal Republic is pointed in the right direction.

The time is not far off when we shall see the results of our German experiment. In the meantime the debate will go on between those who say that "Nazism is dead and buried" and those who point to the fact that many Nazis are again in key positions of power. It seems clear that if we continue to ignore the facts, if we continue to rely on a policy that is misled by a façade, then "our deeds today will haunt our children tomorrow."
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